



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE **108th** CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 2003

No. 45—Part II

House of Representatives

□ 1715

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004—Continued

Here it is, very carefully worked out, using established models. In fact, Macroeconomic Advisors are retained by the CEA. We beat them two to one for one sixth of the cost in job generation and GDP growth.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). All time for general debate on the resolution has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment printed in part A of House Report 108-44 is adopted and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 95, as amended pursuant to House Resolution 151, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 95

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds for Legislation Assumed in Budget Aggregates

Sec. 301. Reserve fund for medicare modernization and prescription drugs.

Sec. 302. Reserve fund for medicaid.

Sec. 303. Reserve fund for bioshield.

Subtitle B—Contingency Procedure for Legislation Not Assumed in Budget Aggregates

Sec. 311. Contingency procedure for surface transportation.

Subtitle C—Implementation

Sec. 321. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Restrictions on advance appropriations in the House Enforcement Act of 1990.

Sec. 402. Compliance with section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,323,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,350,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,519,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,662,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,793,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,902,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,017,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,130,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,235,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,364,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,502,635,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$36,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$116,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$97,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$77,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$60,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$60,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$60,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$62,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$191,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$285,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$301,575,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the ap-

propriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,790,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,838,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,952,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$2,076,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,177,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,282,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,383,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,481,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,597,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,704,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,832,479,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,776,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,847,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,943,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$2,045,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,139,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,244,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,350,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,451,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,574,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,667,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,803,936,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$453,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$497,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$423,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$382,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$345,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$341,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$333,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$320,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$338,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$302,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$301,301,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$6,687,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$7,264,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$7,794,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$8,302,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$8,777,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$9,251,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$9,719,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$10,179,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$10,660,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$11,112,000,000,000.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2171

Fiscal year 2013: \$11,564,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$3,858,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004: \$4,179,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005: \$4,416,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$4,597,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$4,720,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$4,819,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$4,889,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$4,926,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$4,963,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$4,949,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$4,918,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$392,494,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$386,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$400,546,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$400,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$420,071,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$414,237,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$440,185,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$426,011,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$460,435,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$438,656,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$480,886,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$462,861,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$494,067,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$480,650,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$507,840,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$497,348,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$522,103,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$516,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$536,531,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$523,884,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$551,323,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$543,541,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,506,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,750,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,654,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,631,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,090,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,090,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,557,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,271,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,344,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,120,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,303,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,775,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,284,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,466,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,078,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,315,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,148,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,716,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,006,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,576,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,153,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,556,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,771,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,348,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,591,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,082,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,344,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,690,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,153,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,425,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,899,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,127,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,504,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,799,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,140,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,435,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,079,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,464,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,735,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,134,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,393,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,074,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$439,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,583,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$928,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,707,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$961,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,609,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,244,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,431,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,022,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,988,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,977,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,660,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,085,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,781,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,181,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,955,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,288,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,316,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,401,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,293,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,816,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,940,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,240,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,868,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,253,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,276,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,945,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,203,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,453,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,335,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,230,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,713,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,463,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,843,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,432,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,768,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,438,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,752,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,354,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,626,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,251,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,600,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,418,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,365,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,192,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,363,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,481,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,205,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,197,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,567,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,430,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,607,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,543,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,998,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,091,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,293,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,526,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,781,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,030,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,390,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,654,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,155,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,413,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,812,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,881,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,405,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,494,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,637,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,957,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,151,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,965,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,171,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,103,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,635,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,970,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,774,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,982,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,750,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,545,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,952,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,141,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,042,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$828,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,259,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,056,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,091,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$67,847,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,430,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,225,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,806,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,917,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,718,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,538,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,726,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,264,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,692,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,297,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,881,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,552,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,084,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,915,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,789,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,410,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,498,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$74,004,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,283,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,640,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,251,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,994,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,137,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,923,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,356,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,991,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,647,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,119,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,968,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,918,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,351,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,702,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,803,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,076,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,146,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,524,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,858,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,892,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,256,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,288,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$86,169,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,340,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,748,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$85,706,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$83,598,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$86,670,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$84,639,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,650,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$86,417,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,811,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$88,355,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,393,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$90,486,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$93,935,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$92,170,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,832,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$93,936,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$97,635,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$95,713,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$99,536,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$97,602,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$221,878,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$218,021,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$235,103,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$235,479,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$248,663,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$248,358,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$265,462,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$264,949,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$284,237,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$283,363,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$303,780,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$302,637,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$324,153,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$322,870,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$345,696,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$344,412,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$370,681,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$369,399,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$395,391,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$394,133,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$423,754,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$422,447,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$248,586,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$248,434,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$266,538,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$266,865,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$282,932,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$285,912,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$322,237,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$319,017,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$344,656,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$344,943,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$370,545,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$370,436,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$396,931,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$396,685,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$424,989,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$425,263,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$452,618,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$455,994,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$489,873,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$486,064,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$528,586,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$528,861,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$326,588,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$334,373,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$315,485,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$321,120,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$325,921,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$329,359,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$331,772,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$334,216,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$336,386,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$338,308,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$344,748,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$345,993,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$352,988,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$353,901,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$360,370,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$361,147,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$374,372,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$375,115,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$377,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$378,358,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$391,496,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$392,351,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,255,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,255,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,223,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,222,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,330,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,330,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,451,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,451,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,975,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,975,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,827,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,827,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,982,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,982,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,357,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,357,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,235,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,235,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,450,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,481,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,481,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,597,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,486,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,567,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,119,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,847,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,632,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,830,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,348,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,074,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,696,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,557,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,939,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,695,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,222,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,938,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,714,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$72,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$74,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$74,198,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$38,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$37,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$40,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,676,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$37,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$38,884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$40,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$40,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$42,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$41,855,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$44,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,471,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,779,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,038,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,374,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$239,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$239,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$256,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$256,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$303,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$303,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$342,042,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$342,042,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$367,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$367,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$389,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$389,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$410,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$410,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$429,676,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$429,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$450,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$450,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$471,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$471,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$489,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$489,580,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, -\$292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, -\$93,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, -\$36,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, -\$15,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$0.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$0.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$0.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$0.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, -\$41,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$41,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, -\$42,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$42,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, -\$52,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$52,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, -\$54,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$54,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, -\$51,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$51,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, -\$53,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$53,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, -\$52,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$52,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, -\$54,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$54,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, -\$56,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$56,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, -\$59,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$59,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -\$61,229,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$61,229,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TAX SIMPLIFICATION AND FAIRNESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 11, 2003, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to—

(1) reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: \$35,420,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$112,785,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$387,719,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$662,874,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013; and

(2) increase the level of direct spending for that committee by \$4,380,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003, \$1,111,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$17,393,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$23,096,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the level of direct spending for that committee by \$3,600,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 and outlays flowing therefrom.

(b) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.—

(1) FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.—(A) The Congress finds that—

(i) the Inspector General of the Department of Education has found that nearly 23 percent of recipients whose loans were discharged due to disability claims were gainfully employed;

(ii) based on data provided by the Office of Management and Budget, the House Committee on the Budget estimates that more than \$8 billion in erroneous earned income tax payments are made each year;

(iii) the Office of Management and Budget estimates that erroneous payments for food stamps account for almost 9 percent of total benefits;

(iv) mismanagement of more than \$3 billion in trust funds controlled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs led the Congress to take extraordinary measures to regain control of the these funds;

(v) in its Semiannual Reports to Congress, the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management has documented numerous instances of the Government continuing to make electronic payments for retirement benefits through the Civil Service Retirement System after the death of the eligible annuitants; and

(vi) numerous other examples of waste, fraud, and abuse are reported regularly by government watchdog agencies.

(B) It is, therefore, the purpose of this subsection to utilize the reconciliation process to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse in mandatory programs.

(2) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 18, 2003, the House committees named in paragraph (3) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget to carry out this subsection. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the

House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(3) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$600,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$5,532,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$18,618,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$261,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$2,596,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$9,421,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$2,397,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$25,265,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$107,359,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$62,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$678,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$2,864,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(E) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The House Committee on Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$1,072,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$10,371,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$38,319,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013. For the purposes of this subparagraph and section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, a reduction in outlays submitted pursuant to this subparagraph that results from changes in programs within the jurisdiction of other committees shall count as a reduction in outlays for the Committee on Government Reform.

(F) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—The House Committee on House Administration shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$4,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$26,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$88,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(G) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.—The House Committee on International Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$157,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$1,293,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$4,468,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(H) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$86,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$727,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004

through 2008, and \$2,404,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(I) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$40,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$345,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$1,105,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(J) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE.—The House Committee on Science shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$1,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$6,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$15,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(K) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$114,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$1,099,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$3,702,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(L) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$449,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$4,221,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$14,626,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(M) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$1,971,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$17,704,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$61,547,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds for Legislation Assumed in Budget Aggregates

SEC. 301. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE MODERNIZATION AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides a prescription drug benefit and modernizes medicare, and provides adjustments to the medicare program on a fee-for-service, capitated, or other basis, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate committee allocations described in subsection (c) for such committees and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$7,500,000,000 in new budget authority and \$7,500,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004 and \$400,000,000,000 in new budget authority and \$400,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(b) APPLICATION.—After the consideration of any measure for which an adjustment is made pursuant to subsection (a), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make any further appropriate adjustments in allocations and budget aggregates.

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, there shall be a separate section 302(a) allocation to the appropriate committees for medicare. For purposes of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the "first fiscal

year" and the "total of fiscal years" shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2004 and the total of fiscal years 2004 through 2013 included in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution, respectively. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for medicare under section 302(a) of such Act.

SEC. 302. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID.

In the House, if the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that—

(1) modernizes medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), and

(2) reduces new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom by \$9,010,000,000 for fiscal years 2009 through 2013, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase allocations of new budget authority and outlays for that committee (and make other appropriate changes in budgetary aggregates) by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$3,258,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2004 and \$8,944,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008.

SEC. 303. RESERVE FUND FOR BIOSHIELD.

In the House, if the appropriate committee of jurisdiction reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes a program to accelerate the research, development, and purchase of biomedical threat countermeasures and—

(1) such measure provides new budget authority to carry out such program; or

(2) such measure authorizes discretionary new budget authority to carry out such program and the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution that provides new budget authority to carry out such program, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations for the committee providing such new budget authority, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, by the amount provided for that purpose, but, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (1), not to exceed \$890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom and \$3,418,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom or, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (2), not to exceed \$890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the total such revision for fiscal year 2004 may not exceed \$890,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom.

Subtitle B—Contingency Procedure for Legislation Not Assumed in Budget Aggregates

SEC. 311. CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—In the House, if the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

- (1) for fiscal year 2004: \$39,135,000,000,
- (2) for fiscal year 2005: \$39,786,000,000,
- (3) for fiscal year 2006: \$40,502,000,000,
- (4) for fiscal year 2007: \$41,219,000,000, or
- (5) for fiscal year 2008: \$42,002,000,000,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate budget aggregates and increase the allocation of new budget authority to such committee for fiscal year 2004 and for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 to the extent such excess is offset by a reduction in mandatory outlays from the Highway Trust Fund or an increase in receipts appropriated to such fund for the applicable fiscal year caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation.

(b) **ADJUSTMENT FOR OUTLAYS.**—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that changes obligation limitations such that the total limitations are in excess of \$38,496,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such fiscal year for the committee reporting such measure by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a).

Subtitle C—Implementation

SEC. 321. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE.**—In the House, for the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution, sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall apply to fiscal year 2004 and the total for fiscal year 2004 and the four ensuing fiscal years.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE HOUSE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2005 and fiscal years 2005 and 2006 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$23,178,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2004 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2004.

SEC. 402. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No further amendment is in order except the amendments printed in part B of the report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House report 108-44.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. HILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 1 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. HILL:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

(a) **DECLARATION.**—The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate levels for fiscal years 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Homeland security.

Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

Sec. 202. Increase in debt limit contingent upon plan to restore balanced budget.

Sec. 203. Review of budget outlook.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds

Sec. 301. Reserve fund for homeland security.

Sec. 302. Reserve fund for the costs of military operations in Iraq.

Sec. 303. Reserve fund for additional mandatory funding for existing health and employment programs which provide assistance to States and individuals.

Sec. 304. Reserve fund for surface transportation.

Sec. 305. Reserve fund for bioshield.

Sec. 306. Reserve fund for permanent extension of tax cuts; medicare.

Subtitle B—Enforcement

Sec. 311. Point of order against certain legislation reducing the surplus or increasing the deficit after fiscal year 2008.

Sec. 312. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 313. Discretionary spending limits in the House.

Sec. 314. Emergency legislation.

Sec. 315. Pay-as-you-go point of order in the House.

Sec. 316. Disclosure of effect of legislation on the public debt.

Sec. 317. Disclosure of interest costs.

Sec. 318. Dynamic scoring of tax legislation.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Sense of Congress regarding budget enforcement.

Sec. 402. Sense of Congress on tax reform.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2013:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,441,770,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,604,926,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$1,746,972,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$1,863,966,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$1,981,577,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$2,099,530,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$2,226,842,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: \$2,460,796,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$2,637,779,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,778,210,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$30,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$12,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: —\$6,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: —\$10,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: —\$18,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: —\$21,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: —\$33,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: —\$33,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$0.

Fiscal year 2013: \$0.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,843,018,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,951,195,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$2,071,194,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$2,171,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$2,276,515,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$2,373,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$2,472,581,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: \$2,585,874,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$2,662,041,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,768,930,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,851,551,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,942,306,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$2,045,298,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$2,140,438,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$2,249,176,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$2,355,806,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$2,461,760,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: \$2,586,165,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$2,653,413,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,776,371,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$409,781,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$337,380,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$298,326,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$276,472,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$267,599,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$256,276,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$234,918,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: \$125,369,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$15,634,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013: \$—1,839,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$7,179,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$7,621,902,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$8,048,310,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$8,457,629,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$8,861,982,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$9,258,280,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$9,637,286,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: \$9,911,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$10,082,375,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013: \$10,239,283,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$4,072,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$4,221,902,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$4,321,310,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$4,378,629,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$4,406,982,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$4,404,280,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$4,361,286,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: \$4,191,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$3,895,375,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013: \$3,568,283,000,000.

SEC. 102. HOMELAND SECURITY.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 for Homeland Security are as follows:

(1) New budget authority, \$41,035,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2004 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$400,476,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$400,882,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$420,071,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$414,205,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$440,185,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$426,007,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$460,435,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$438,656,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$480,886,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$462,861,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$494,067,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$480,650,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$507,840,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$497,348,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$522,103,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$516,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$536,531,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$523,884,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$551,323,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$543,541,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,681,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,207,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,734,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,917,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,308,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,539,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,603,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,464,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,611,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,604,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,413,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,733,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,258,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,689,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,136,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,565,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,005,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,408,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,885,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,298,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,503,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,678,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,330,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,618,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,112,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,316,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,949,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,097,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,722,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,833,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,350,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,528,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,006,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,183,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,687,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,847,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,372,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,520,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,062,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,198,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,690,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$959,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,828,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,020,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,741,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,322,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,559,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,097,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,446,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,111,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,218,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,823,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,319,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,006,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,430,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,386,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,547,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,359,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,237,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,357,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,084,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,996,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,824,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,998,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,384,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,168,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,240,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,612,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,577,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,835,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,647,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,857,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,684,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,870,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,629,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,772,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,549,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,769,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,629,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,693,000

(B) Outlays, \$24,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,472,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$7,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$8,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$8,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$8,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$8,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,731,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$59,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$68,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$67,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$65,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$68,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$67,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$71,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$67,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$73,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$68,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$77,306,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,628,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,174,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,019,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,205,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,579,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$88,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$85,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$87,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$84,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$89,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$86,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$91,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$88,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$93,852,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$91,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$95,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$93,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$97,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$95,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$99,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$97,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$101,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$98,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$103,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$100,775,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$240,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$239,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$252,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$251,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$269,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$268,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$290,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$288,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$312,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$310,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$335,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$333,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$361,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$359,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$389,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$387,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$419,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$418,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$452,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$451,354,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$265,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$265,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$282,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$285,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$322,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$318,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$344,455,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$344,725,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$370,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$370,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$396,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$396,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$423,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$424,026,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$455,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$459,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$490,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$486,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$526,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$526,559,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$318,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$323,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$326,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$329,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$334,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$337,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$340,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$342,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$352,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$353,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$363,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$364,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$375,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$376,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$392,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$392,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$383,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$384,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$398,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$398,881,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,999,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,670,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$61,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$61,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$67,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,612,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,215,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$63,680,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$67,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$67,654,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$69,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$71,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,868,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$75,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,539,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$72,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$72,399,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$77,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$77,329,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$40,902,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,271,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,318,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,164,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,984,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$40,059,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$41,148,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,304,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,590,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,938,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,776,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,677,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,381,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,533,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,138,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,835,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,560,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,489,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,121,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$253,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$254,890,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$293,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$296,538,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$325,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$329,817,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$344,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$351,017,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$360,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$369,089,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$375,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$386,360,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$387,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$401,485,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$397,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$414,520,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$401,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$422,797,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$397,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$425,508,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.0
(B) Outlays, \$0.0

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.0
(B) Outlays, \$0.0

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.0
(B) Outlays, \$0.0

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.0
(B) Outlays, \$0.0

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.0
(B) Outlays, \$0.0

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, -\$1,116,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$435,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, -\$2,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,232,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, -\$3,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$2,360,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, -\$5,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$3,687,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, -\$6,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$5,040,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, -\$45,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$45,580,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, -\$55,509,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$55,509,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, -\$57,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$57,437,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, -\$52,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$52,206,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, -\$54,753,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$54,753,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, -\$56,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$56,560,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, -\$58,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$58,985,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, -\$61,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$61,522,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, -\$66,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$66,358,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, -\$68,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$68,977,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION**SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**

(a) **SUBMISSION PROVIDING ECONOMIC GROWTH.**—(1) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill not later than April 11, 2003, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: \$46,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2003 and 2004 and increase the total level of revenues by not more than \$49,900,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(2) It is the sense of the Congress that in complying with the instructions set forth in paragraph (1) the Committee on Ways and Means should provide immediate tax relief and economic stimulus by accelerating tax relief for middle-class families through increases in the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, and reductions in individual income tax rates, provide incentives for business investment, provide immediate and permanent estate tax relief and defer tax relief for individual taxpayers with incomes above \$140,000 until the budget is in balance and national security threats have been addressed.

(b) **SUBMISSIONS REGARDING MEDICARE REFORM AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.**—Not later than July 18, 2003, the committees named in this subsection shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revisions.

(1) **COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.**—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reform medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit, such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$6,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004 and \$400,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(2) **COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.**—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reform medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit, such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$6,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004 and \$400,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

SEC. 202. INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT CONTINGENT UPON PLAN TO RESTORE BALANCED BUDGET.

(a) **TEMPORARY INCREASE IN STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT.**—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House shall report a bill as soon as practicable, but not later than April 11, 2003, that consists solely of changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the statutory debt limit by \$150,000,000,000.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER.**—(1) Except as provided by subsection (a) or paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that increases the limit on the public debt by more than \$100,000,000,000.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the House if—

(A) the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House has made the certification described in section 203 that the unified budget will be in balance by fiscal year 2009; or

(B) the President has submitted to Congress a declaration that such increase is necessary to finance costs of a military conflict

or address an imminent threat to national security, but which shall not exceed the amount of the adjustment under section 302 for the costs of military operations in Iraq.

SEC. 203. REVIEW OF BUDGET OUTLOOK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If, in the report released pursuant to section 202 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, entitled the Budget and Economic Outlook Update (for fiscal years 2004 through 2013), the Director of the Congressional Budget Office projects that the unified budget of the United States for fiscal year 2009 will be in balance, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House is authorized to certify that the budget is projected to meet the goals of a balanced budget.

(b) CALCULATING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING BASELINE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall use the discretionary spending levels set forth in this resolution, including any adjustments to such levels as a result of the implementation of any reserve funds set forth in this resolution to calculate the discretionary spending baseline.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds

SEC. 301. RESERVE FUND FOR HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for the Department of Homeland Security and if the Secretary of Homeland Security so requests, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Homeland Security should—

(1) conduct a homeland security needs assessment in consultation with all Federal agencies with responsibilities for homeland security and State and local governments; and

(2) submit a report to Congress with additional funding requests, if any, identified in the needs assessment, and that such report should also include a compilation of the needs assessments submitted by State and local governments.

SEC. 302. RESERVE FUND FOR THE COSTS OF MILITARY OPERATIONS IN IRAQ.

In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for the costs of military operations in Iraq, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose.

SEC. 303. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL MANDATORY FUNDING FOR EXISTING HEALTH AND EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WHICH PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND INDIVIDUALS.

In the House, if the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, or the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for additional mandatory funding for existing health and employment programs which provide assistance

to States and individuals, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but such revision shall not exceed \$12,500,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 304. RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

- (1) for fiscal year 2004: \$30,340,000,000,
- (2) for fiscal year 2005: \$30,998,000,000,
- (3) for fiscal year 2006: \$31,707,000,000,
- (4) for fiscal year 2007: \$32,436,000,000, or
- (5) for fiscal year 2008: \$33,190,000,000,

and the amount of such excess in each such year is offset by reductions in the deficit caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation that changes direct spending from, or receipts subsequently appropriated to, the Highway Trust Fund, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority for such committee by the amount of such excess for fiscal year 2004 and by the total amount of such excesses for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and make the necessary offsetting adjustments in the appropriate budget aggregates and allocations.

(b) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes obligation limitations that, in total, are in excess of \$38,496,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a), for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such fiscal year for the Committee on Appropriations by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations.

SEC. 305. RESERVE FUND FOR BIOSHIELD.

In the House, if the appropriate committee of jurisdiction reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes a program to accelerate the research, development, and purchase of biomedical threat countermeasures and—

- (1) such measure provides new budget authority to carry out such program; or
- (2) such measure authorizes discretionary new budget authority to carry out such program and the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution that provides new budget authority to carry out such program,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations for the committee providing such new budget authority, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, by the amount provided for that purpose, but, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (1), not to exceed \$890,000,000 in

new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom and \$3,418,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom or, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (2), not to exceed \$890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the total such revision for fiscal year 2004 may not exceed \$890,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 306. RESERVE FUND FOR PERMANENT EXTENSION OF TAX CUTS; MEDICARE.

In the House, notwithstanding section 311 of this resolution, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that makes the provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 permanent or provides additional resources for a medicare prescription drug benefit in excess of \$400,000,000,000 over the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013, and if the chairman on the Committee on the Budget certifies that the enactment of such legislation would not cause or increase an on-budget deficit in 2013, then the chairman on the Committee on the Budget shall revise allocations to accommodate such legislation and make other necessary adjustments.

Subtitle B—Enforcement

SEC. 311. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN LEGISLATION REDUCING THE SURPLUS OR INCREASING THE DEFICIT AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2008.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that first provides new budget authority or a decrease in revenues for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2013 that would decrease the surplus or increase the deficit for any fiscal year.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House certifies, based on estimates prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, that Congress has enacted legislation restoring 75-year solvency of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance Trust Fund and legislation extending the solvency of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for 20 years.

SEC. 312. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 313. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS IN THE HOUSE.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto, that provides new budget authority that would cause the discretionary spending limits to be exceeded for any fiscal year.

(b) **DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.**—In the House and as used in this section, the term “discretionary spending limit” means—

(8) with respect to fiscal year 2004—

(A) for the defense category: \$399,683,000,000 in new budget authority and \$389,746,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: \$392,517,000,000 in new budget authority and \$429,054,000,000 in outlays;

(9) with respect to fiscal year 2005—

(A) for the defense category: \$420,019,000,000 in new budget authority and \$409,737,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: \$393,481,000,000 in new budget authority and \$440,264,000,000 in outlays;

(10) with respect to fiscal year 2006—

(A) for the defense category: \$440,044,000,000 in new budget authority and \$422,808,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: \$402,256,000,000 in new budget authority and \$446,992,000,000;

(11) with respect to fiscal year 2007—

(A) for the defense category: \$460,309,000,000 in new budget authority and \$436,164,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: \$412,091,000,000 in new budget authority and \$455,236,000,000;

(12) with respect to fiscal year 2008—

(A) for the defense category: \$480,747,000,000 in new budget authority and \$460,190,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: \$494,853,000,000 in new budget authority and \$465,710,000,000;

as adjusted in conformance with subsection (c).

(c) **ADJUSTMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **CHAIRMAN.**—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution, the offering of an amendment thereto, or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the adjustments set forth in subparagraph (B) for the amount of new budget authority in that measure (if that measure meets the requirements set forth in paragraph (2)) and the outlays flowing from that budget authority. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may also make appropriate adjustments for the reserve funds set forth in sections 301, 302, and 303.

(B) **MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.**—The adjustments referred to in subparagraph (A) are to be made to—

(i) the discretionary spending limits, if any, set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget;

(ii) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(iii) the budgetary aggregates as set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) **AMOUNTS OF ADJUSTMENTS.**—The adjustment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) an amount provided and designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 314;

(B) an amount appropriated for homeland security as provided in section 301;

(C) an amount appropriated for military operations in Iraq as provided in section 302; and

(D) an amount provided for transportation under section 304.

(3) **APPLICATION OF ADJUSTMENTS.**—The adjustments made for legislation pursuant to paragraph (1) shall—

(A) apply while that legislation is under consideration;

(B) take effect upon the enactment of that legislation; and

(C) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(4) **APPLICATION OF THIS SECTION.**—The provisions of this section shall apply to legislation providing new budget authority for fiscal years 2003 through 2008.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—(1) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of this section.

(2)(A) This subsection shall apply only to the House of Representatives.

(B) In order to be cognizable by the Chair, a point of order under this section must specify the precise language on which it is premised.

(C) As disposition of points of order under this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the points of order.

(D) A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by each Member initiating a point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent on each point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

(E) The disposition of the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to a bill or joint resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

SEC. 314. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.**—If a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation is enacted or if appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that the President designates as an emergency requirement and that the Congress so designates in statute, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be designated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this resolution.

(b) **DESIGNATIONS.**—

(1) **GUIDANCE.**—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under subsection (a), the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets all the criteria in paragraph (2).

(2) **CRITERIA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change is an emergency requirement are that the expenditure or tax change is—

(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iv) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) **UNFORESEEN.**—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(3) **JUSTIFICATION FOR USE OF DESIGNATION.**—When an emergency designation is

proposed in any bill, joint resolution, or conference report thereon, the committee report and the statement of managers accompanying a conference report, as the case may be, shall provide a written justification of why the provision meets the criteria set forth in paragraph (2).

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “direct spending”, “receipts”, and “appropriations for discretionary accounts” means any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that provides direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) **SEPARATE HOUSE VOTE ON EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.**—(1) In the House, in the consideration of any measure for amendment in the Committee of the Whole containing any emergency spending designation, it shall always be in order unless specifically waived by terms of a rule governing consideration of that measure, to move to strike such emergency spending designation from the portion of the bill then open to amendment.

(2) The Committee on Rules shall include in the report required by clause 1(d) of rule XI (relating to its activities during the Congress) of the Rules of House of Representatives a separate item identifying all waivers of points of order relating to emergency spending designations, listed by bill or joint resolution number and the subject matter of that measure.

(e) **COMMITTEE NOTIFICATION OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.**—Whenever the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of either House (including a committee of conference) reports any bill or joint resolution that provides budget authority for any emergency, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution (or the joint explanatory statement of managers in the case of a conference report on any such bill or joint resolution) shall identify all provisions that provide budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom for such emergency and include a statement of the reasons why such budget authority meets the definition of an emergency pursuant to the guidelines described in subsection (b).

(f) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report, the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(g) **EXCEPTION FOR DEFENSE AND HOMELAND SECURITY SPENDING.**—Subsection (d) shall not apply against an emergency designation for a provision making discretionary appropriations in the defense category and for homeland security programs.

SEC. 315. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) **APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable time period” means any 1 of the 3 following periods:

(A) The first year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(B) The period of the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(C) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 fiscal years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) **DIRECT-SPENDING LEGISLATION.**—For purposes of this subsection and except as

provided in paragraph (4), the term "direct-spending legislation" means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms "direct-spending legislation" and "revenue legislation" do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget;

(B) any reconciliation bill reported pursuant to section 201 of this resolution;

(C) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990; or

(D) any legislation for which an adjustment is made under section 302.

(5) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget as adjusted for any changes in revenues or direct spending assumed by such resolution; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) PRIOR SURPLUS.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted pursuant to reconciliation instructions since the beginning of that same calendar year shall not be available.

(b) APPEALS.—Appeals in the House from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—(1) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of this section.

(2)(A) This subsection shall apply only to the House of Representatives.

(B) In order to be cognizable by the Chair, a point of order under this section must specify the precise language on which it is premised.

(C) As disposition of points of order under this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the points of order.

(D) A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by each Member initiating a point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent on each point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

(E) The disposition of the question of consideration under this subsection with respect

to a bill or joint resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

(e) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on September 30, 2008.

SEC. 316. DISCLOSURE OF EFFECT OF LEGISLATION ON THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Each report of a committee of the House on a public bill or public joint resolution shall contain an estimate by the committee of the amount the public debt would be increased (including related debt service costs) in carrying out the bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and in the 5-fiscal year period beginning with such fiscal year (or for the authorized duration of any program authorized by the bill or joint resolution if less than five years).

SEC. 317. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST COSTS.

Whenever a committee of either House of Congress reports to its House legislation providing new budget authority or providing an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution shall contain a projection by the Congressional Budget Office of the cost of the debt servicing that would be caused by such measure for such fiscal year (or fiscal years) and each of the 4 ensuing fiscal years.

SEC. 318. DYNAMIC SCORING OF TAX LEGISLATION.

Any report of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of any bill or joint resolution reported by that committee that proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and which report includes an estimate prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation pursuant to clause 2(h)(2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall also contain an estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office regarding the macroeconomic effect of any increase or decrease in the estimated budget deficit resulting from such bill or joint resolution.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted enforcing this resolution by—

(1) setting discretionary spending limits for budget authority and outlays at the levels set forth in this resolution for each of the next 5 fiscal years;

(2) reinstating the pay-as-you-go rules set forth in section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for the next 10 fiscal years;

(3) requiring separate votes to exceed such discretionary spending limits or to waive such pay-as-you-go rules;

(4) establishing a definition for emergency spending and requiring a justification for emergency spending requests and legislation; and

(5) establishing expedited rescission authority regarding congressional votes on rescission submitted by the President and reducing discretionary spending limits to reflect savings from any rescissions enacted into law.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TAX REFORM.

It is the sense of Congress that the Committee on Ways and Means should—

(1) work with the Secretary of the Treasury to draft legislation reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in a revenue-neutral manner to improve savings and investment; and

(2) consider changes that address the treatment of dividends and retirement savings, corporate tax avoidance, and simplification of the tax laws.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to myself as much time as I may consume.

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog plan that we are offering today combines short-term economic stimulus and immediate tax relief for all taxpayers with long-term fiscal discipline to balance the budget by 2009 and return to saving the Social Security surplus by 2013. The Blue Dog budget has nearly \$2 trillion less debt than the President's budget from the year 2003 to 2013. The Blue Dog budget calls for tough spending limits by adopting the President's overall spending levels but does not rely on unreasonable or unrealistic spending cuts from the President's proposal.

The Blue Dog budget will hold Congress accountable for the increase in the debt tax by limiting increases in the debt limit and requiring regular votes by Congress to raise the debt limit until the budget is on the path towards balance.

We strongly support the President in the war on terrorism and in keeping a strong defense. Our budget provides the President with everything he requested for defense and homeland security and sets aside a reserve fund for additional funding for homeland security if the administration requests it. The Blue Dog budget is good policy, plain and simple. For every \$1,000 each taxpayer sends to Washington, an income tax roughly \$180 goes to pay the interest on our national debt. The Blue Dog budget reduces that burden while the Republican budget increases that burden. That is what we call the "debt tax." Eighteen percent of the Federal budget, over \$2,500 per person, over \$4,000 per family, and it only gets worse if we follow their plan. Bob Dole called it the stealth tax in 1996. It was mentioned in a 1995 Republican-authored resolution, and it was referenced in the first plank of the 1994 Republican Contract with America.

The debt tax is money that goes towards nothing, and it is a tax that cannot be repealed. It does not make our Nation stronger. It does not make health care more affordable. It does not make our schools better. It does not provide more jobs, and it surely does not make our economy more robust.

It is time to get back on the track towards balancing the Federal budget. We cannot and should not send our troops, our brave men and women, into battle, then saddle them with the bill. It is not the right thing to do, and everybody in this body knows it. The Blue Dog budget will restore fiscal responsibility, stability, and accountability to Federal budgeting process. A

great American from the great State of Tennessee once said that no nation has ever been free, strong, and broke.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as I may consume. I respectfully claim the time in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, obviously I support the work of the committee, the underlying resolution, the budget resolution that is forwarded today. I want to thank the Blue Dog Coalition for coming forth with yet another budget proposal this year. I believe this is a consistent track record for the Blue Dogs in providing a budget resolution for consideration. We will disagree with that budget here today as they disagree with our budget, but I want to start by complimenting them because even last year at a time when the minority did not come forward with a caucus position, the Blue Dogs did. And the so-called Blue Dogs in this instance have done so again and I want to respect that. Only people who have actually gone through the process of writing a budget know how difficult that task can be in making some of the choices one has to make in order to arrive at this.

I disagree with their approach, however, for a number of reasons. First of all, I do not believe what they are putting forward supports our economy. I believe what we need right now is a growth package. The President has put that forward. We indicated that the second most important part of our budget is providing growth to the economy to create jobs. We believe we need tax simplification. We believe we need tax reform. We believe we need to lower the tax on the American people at a time of recession, not just for the sake of lowering taxes but because we know, we have seen this happen in the past many times in history where when we reduce the tax burden on America, when we reduce it particularly to a level at or below the average of taxes and revenues compared to the gross domestic product, that that does have a growth effect, a stimulative effect, on the economy.

And so while we will agree today on national defense and homeland security, probably the biggest departure we will see between these two budgets is regarding growth in the economy and creating jobs. We just happen to believe on our side that getting a growth package through to create jobs is vitally important. We are also going to have a semantical debate here today. I do not want to throw gasoline on the fire, so I am going to try not to. But I have to say that if we are not going to continue an already-reduced reduction in taxes, I mean I do not know what we call that. I know many on my side have come down here and I know it makes my friends in the Blue Dog Coalition cringe when they hear it when we have heard on our side that that be explained as a tax increase, but you might be able to understand why you

cringe when you see us cringe when a reduction in the anticipated increase is called a cut.

And time after time today we have seen Members come to the floor on the other side of the aisle and explain that we are making excruciating cuts in veterans and education and Medicare and Medicaid and all sorts of different programs when in fact that is simply not the case. One not only cannot find it within our budget document, but in fact that is not the choice that we request. What we request is that we go through the budget and we look for waste, fraud, and abuse and places where we have been spending money we did not have to, and we do not have all of them but these are just some examples that you do not ask us to go after: Foreign Assistance, the Effectiveness and Accountability of Problems Common to U.S. Programs, Taking Strategic Approach for DOD and the Acquisition of Services, Implementation of an Electronic Benefit Transfer System in the Food Stamp Program, IRS's Efforts to Improve Compliance with the Employment Tax.

I mean, all of these save money. All of these find places where we are just not doing a good job. All of these ought to be a hearing. All of these ought to be a place where we can introduce legislation and we can say that is not a cut. To go through this and to actually look at the General Accounting Office, and we pay them a lot of money. Talk about waste. If you are going to hire people to go through the programs from the General Accounting Office and then you do not even listen to them, my friend, the comptroller general, would not like my saying this, but why do we hire these folks to give us these good ideas of places we can reduce spending, not cutting benefits, not cutting services, not closing nursing homes, not cutting off senior citizens, not eliminating Meals on Wheels or food stamps or school lunches or, oh, my goodness, all of the things that people have come down here wringing their hands about today, but just going through here: Controlling the Weakness in Property Vulnerable to Improper Use, Loss and Theft. There is a real partisan issue, theft. I mean if we are stealing things from agencies, from departments, and I have heard everything from a 61-inch television; I mean, come on.

Does that balance the budget? No. We are not suggesting that alone balances the budget, but we have got to start somewhere.

I could go on. The Deteriorating Financial Outlook and the Need for Transformation in the Postal Service, Medicare, Medicaid, FAA. Here is one, let us see, Significant Weakness in the Computer Controls. And, in fact, I believe we spent \$8 million trying to get the Department of Agriculture to go to a new computer system; and guess what, after I think 8 years and \$8 million, they found out they could not go to the new system. So we just spent \$8

million for nothing on that. Defense Acquisitions, Debt Collection, Food Stamps. Again, there is another one. But if we even look at food stamps, people will say we are somehow throwing the poor out in the street. Medicare, here we go again. Boy, do not touch Medicare, though. Do not even look there. Heaven forbid. It must be a perfect program. Just add more benefits, and it will be fine. I mean, we could go on and on. They are replete. I have got a whole pile over on this side. You do not look at that. And that is an important area where we believe it is time to challenge the committees to do the work to find the savings.

Last but not least, I believe that it is time that we do something together around here, and that is enforce the budget. I know that we are going to disagree today on a number of these topics. The thing that is so frustrating is when time after time Members, and it happens in the Blue Dogs, it happens on our side as well, where we come down here, we talk about our budgets and then during the appropriations process we blow through those things. We find different ways to come through the process without holding to the budget that we agreed to. I would hope that my friends in the Blue Dog Coalition more than anybody else, and I know they do, believe that once we have a budget, it is time to enforce it because if we cannot even enforce that, having this debate today is going to be meaningless.

So as I started off with today, we do not support just allowing these tax cuts to expire. We happen to believe that does increase the tax burden. We want to make sure that we have spending restraint. You claim to do it with interest payments; but we want to do it with actual spending, not just with interest payments; and we want to make sure that we figure out a way to grow the economy and create jobs. And for those reasons I respectfully oppose the Blue Dog budget, but wish them congratulations on actually creating one which is something that many people around here claim they want to do, but do not always accomplish.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, but I want to use a portion of my time commending him, but I wanted to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. NUSSLE. What?

Mr. STENHOLM. I will when it comes my time, but I will do it on my own time, but I am curious because it seems to me over the last 8 years you talk about your party has been in control. So all of the points that you make with the blue books, why have we not done it?

□ 1730

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I can tell the gentleman

why. It is a frustration of mine, and it is the reason why I put the budget out that I did this year.

When we got to surplus, and we have seen the chart, when we got to balancing and began going into surplus, particularly into discretionary spending, all of us around here very cheerfully started getting into a bidding war. We could do a little better than you in education, you could do a little better than us in health care. We went on and on and on.

Look at the charts in any of those categories. Once 1998 happened, as my friend knows, we could not say no to anything. It was very difficult to try to control that. That is just the discretionary side, which, as the gentleman knows, is only one-quarter of the budget.

On the mandatory side, think of the last time in a partisan or bipartisan way that we tried to take on an entitlement and even tried to control spending. My friend has quite a bit of control or interest in agriculture, as do I. I sit on a committee that has jurisdiction over Medicare and welfare. We did it in welfare and had some real success.

I just want us to start looking at that process again. That is the reason in this budget I challenge the committees. I do not do it myself. I do not try and tell my good friend on the Committee on Agriculture exactly where that ought to come from. But I do challenge him to look at the reports on food stamps and others and say, can we not do a better job?

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, I do not want to leave the impression that the Blue Dog budget is doing anything more than spending what President Bush has asked the Congress to spend, not 1 penny more.

We sometimes get the rhetoric around here, you would think we are big spenders in our budget. We are spending what the President has asked us to spend, and no more.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is a good point. But that is just the first year. We believe that we need to continue to control that spending in the outyears as well.

We also believe, and that is the reason why the budget was presented the way it was, that the President had some areas where we could control. This was true with President Clinton, President Reagan, President Bush, with all of them.

Congress is responsible for controlling spending under Article I of the Constitution. We like to blame the fellow down the street, but, more often than not, it is the people that we look at every day in the mirror that can do the best job at controlling spending.

As I say, I compliment the gentleman and my friends for putting together a budget. We respectfully disagree with that budget for the reasons that I state.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear more from my friends in the coalition.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Blue Dog budget plan, a fiscally responsible proposal that recognizes America's priorities at a time when our country is at war and our Nation is in debt.

The budget resolution before us today is seriously flawed. It is a step in the wrong direction that ignores the realities we are facing as a Nation. The Blue Dog budget, on the other hand, recognizes the costs of waging war, addresses the state of our struggling economy, and answers the needs of ordinary Americans across the Nation.

As we speak, men and women in uniform are fighting to disarm Iraq and are battling al Qaeda in Afghanistan. Hundreds of thousands are now serving their country after being called up, leaving their jobs and their families, many on short notice and at great financial and personal costs. Our troops are indeed making huge sacrifices.

But what about the average American who is not on Active Duty or in the Reserves? How have the rest of us been called upon to make our own contribution to the security and prosperity of the United States? The budget resolution before us includes a host of large tax cuts weighted heavily toward America's wealthiest families. Certainly this cannot be the sacrifice we are expected to make.

In every other conflict since the Civil War, the Commander in Chief has called for an increase in revenues to meet the national defense. Will we be the first generation since the Civil War to reduce revenue during wartime?

Over the last 2 years we have lost almost 2 million jobs. How can we afford to consider large and long-term cuts that will neither improve our defense, stimulate our economy, nor help those most in need?

Many of us who supported tax cuts when we were at peace and enjoying historic surpluses must now oppose any fiscally irresponsible budget with even larger cuts, now that we are at war and spiraling into severe debt. I must ask, where have all the fiscal conservatives gone? Where have they fled from the majority party?

In addition to the much-needed stimulus, the Blue Dog plan prioritizes national defense and homeland security. These priorities are fully funded at levels requested by the President.

While we provide strong support for our national defense and homeland security, we must not turn our backs on important domestic priorities. The American people are begging for a budget that invests in education, health care, and includes a Medicare prescription drug benefit. The Blue Dog

plan responds to Americans across the country and provides a \$400 billion plan for prescription drugs over the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, this plan, the Blue Dog plan, will provide for our defense and homeland security needs, it will provide a vital economic stimulus and sustainable tax relief for ordinary Americans, and the plan will move our country forward with investments in health, education and other domestic priorities. Our plan will accomplish these goals and achieve \$2 trillion less in debt than the administration's plan over the next 10 years.

Americans are a proud and generous people, more than willing to sacrifice for a worthy cause. If, instead, we give ourselves a gift no other war generation has given themselves, we will denude our ability to defend the homeland, or shift the costs to the next generation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD), a new Member, and a fine one at that.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Blue Dog budget. As a cochair of the Blue Dog Caucus, I was proud to work with my colleagues on this fine proposal. In my 22 years as a State legislator in Maine, I have always delivered a balanced budget, and I can tell you that the Blue Dog budget is a great budget.

My time is brief, so I just want to make three vital points about the Blue Dog approach.

First, this budget is balanced. We achieve a \$15 billion surplus by the year 2009, and we have \$2 trillion less in debt over the next 10 years than the President's budget.

Today we spend 18 cents of every dollar on servicing our debt. What a waste of money. This is a debt tax that every American pays, 18 cents on every hard-earned dollar.

We balance the budget and control the debt. The Blue Dog approach reduces waste, and it lowers the taxes that we all pay. Now, that is a tax cut that we all can agree on.

Second, this budget is fair. It funds defense at the same level as the President, it gives tax relief to everyone, and it includes \$60 billion in immediate economic stimulus, including desperately needed assistance to States, States like the State of Maine, which the Committee on the Budget does not provide for.

Third, this budget is just. The Committee on the Budget resolution cuts mandatory spending in many areas. One of the most unconscionable cuts is a \$15 billion reduction for veteran programs. On the very day we go to war, how can we vote to neglect our veterans like this?

Not only does the Blue Dog budget restore these cuts, but it also restores

other funding to vital domestic programs like education, child care, dislocated workers programs and homeland security, and it does all of this within a balanced budget.

I say to my colleagues that this is not a party issue, it is not a political issue. This is about keeping our commitments, investing in our priorities and meeting our responsibilities.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reach across the line that sometimes divides us and unite today for a budget that is balanced, that is fair and that is just.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), a great American.

(Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog budget is based on a very simple premise that basically says that our generation needs to be willing to have the courage to pay the bills that we are incurring and not pass this staggering debt on to our children.

As hard as this may be to imagine, we the people of the United States of America owe \$6.4 trillion. If we follow the budget plan that the majority has put forward, that number will balloon to \$10 trillion, and our country will be unable to meet its obligations. Can you imagine the richest country on Earth dead broke?

Eight months ago Congress increased the debt ceiling by \$450 billion to pay for additional spending and tax cuts. Now the Treasury Department has notified us that we have reached this new debt limit, and it will have to be increased in the coming weeks.

It gets even worse. The Congressional Budget Office recently reported that the deficit for this year will be \$287 billion, and that is without paying any cost of the war that has begun in Iraq. They also predicted over the next 10 years another \$2 trillion of debt will be piled onto what we have already incurred.

Last year taxpayers in this country paid an accrued \$332 billion in interest on revenues of \$1.8 trillion. That amounts to a Federal debt tax on American families of 18 cents on every dollar. Said another way, we have an 18 percent mortgage on this country, and it is growing.

Notwithstanding the moral arguments of what we are doing to the next generation of Americans, at some point, in order to make the public investment needed to keep a world-class military, a healthy and educated workforce, and the bricks-and-mortar infrastructure that enables private enterprise in this country to flourish, we must stop deficit spending.

People since the dawn of civilization have tried to borrow themselves rich. It never worked then, and it will not work now, and it will not work in the future. That is exactly the prescription that the Republicans are asking us to

follow; we can borrow ourselves rich. It will never happen.

We must stop the hemorrhaging, the hemorrhaging, from the Federal Treasury, because it is bleeding from every pore of our body. Any rational person understands that this business plan for our country is not a tenable plan and cannot be sustained over time.

Now, here we are debating today what direction our country will take. This plan includes no cuts in the veterans' programs that some have talked about. But it does something else. At this moment when our men and women in uniform are in battle, they are the only people in this society being asked to sacrifice anything, anything, and that is absolutely unfair. It is not only unfair, it is immoral. So what we have done in the Blue Dog plan is we have asked the most financially well-to-do people in this country to defer the additional tax cuts they get in addition to everybody else under our plan, we have asked them to defer their additional tax cuts in order to help pay for this war so that we do not continue to dig this hole deeper.

Now, I agree with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) on one thing: When you say in Washington, and only in Washington, that an increase is considered a cut because it is not a projected increase, then it is considered a cut here, that is baloney, and I agree with the gentleman. I will also tell the gentleman that when you try to accuse somebody of raising taxes on a tax cut that is not yet effective, that is equally political baloney, and everybody knows it.

I just would say this: Something has got to be done. We cannot continue down this road of debt, more debt and more debt. And if we do not do something about it, we have completely abdicated our responsibility not only to our country today, but to our country tomorrow. That is why I would urge every Member who worries about the financial condition of this country and its ability to maintain the world-class military that we all desire and all of the other things I have talked about, please consider voting for and supporting the Blue Dog budget.

□ 1745

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), the strongest voice in this House about the era of Federal budget deficits.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, before anyone thinks that I am trying to impress upon them that I am a biblical scholar, I will tell my colleagues I am not, but I happened to listen to one Sunday evening. His name is Father Dennis Carver, and he was in Pass Christian, Mississippi. He was talking about a civilization called the Babylonians. They were apparently a very prosperous civilization, but one of the things that was unique about them is that for the sake of their prosperity, they would literally take their chil-

dren, put them on an altar, and slit their throats.

Although the gentleman from Iowa's budget does not quite do that, I will say that it is fair to say that we are burdening our children with so much debt that they cannot possibly hope to attain the sort of lifestyle that we have, or remain the world's greatest Nation.

In 1994, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, gave a speech on this House floor bemoaning the fact that at the time, every American man, woman, and child was \$17,000 in debt as a portion of the national debt. The Republicans took over in 1995. I had hoped things would get better. But since 1995 through today, that same statistic is that every American man, woman, and child is now in debt \$22,000. The Republicans have been in charge, the Republican Party. I had hoped they were truly fiscal conservatives. They have proven otherwise.

If we look at American history, during every single war in American history, and I challenge all of my colleagues to question me on this and look it up for themselves, in every other war in American history, they raised taxes to pay for that war. They took the attitude that those of us who were fortunate enough not to be in the front lines, not to be shot at, not to watch our comrades maimed, ought to at least be willing to pay for that. But there is a difference. Only this generation of Americans is saying that we are going to fight a war, we are going to occupy the nation of Iraq for at least 10 years, with a starting force of 100,000 people as occupiers, but, by the way, we are going to stick these young people in this room and the young people back in Mississippi, the young people in Texas, we are going to stick them with the bill, knowing that they will never have a chance to recover from that and they will continue to squander at least \$1 billion a day every day of our lives as a Nation on interest on that debt.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and other members of the Blue Dog Coalition have done an admirable job of saying, we have to do better. And I have to tell my colleagues, I am going to vote for the Blue Dog budget, but I would have been willing to vote for any budget that freezes all of the tax cuts, because it is simply not fair.

Two years ago, the gentleman from Iowa and others came to this floor and said the President's tax breaks would not increase the national debt. I say to my colleagues they were \$802 billion wrong. At what point do they admit to their mistakes, and at what point do they stop the bleeding?

The Federal debt is still growing. On February 28, 2003, the public debt was \$6,445,790,102,794.08.

The public debt has increased by more than \$802 billion since Congress passed the President's first budget plan on May 9, 2001. The debt grew \$442,337,086,210.23 in the 12

months from February 28, 2002 to February 28, 2003.

There is no surplus except in trust funds. In the first four months of fiscal year 2003, the Treasury reported a budget deficit of \$97.6 billion. However, the trust funds for Social Security, Medicare, military retirement, and federal employees retirement collected \$90.2 billion in surpluses to fund future benefits. Outside these trust funds, the federal government ran a deficit of \$187.8 billion.

During fiscal year 2002, Social Security added \$159 billion to its surplus, and the trust funds for Medicare, military retirement, and federal employee retirement added to total of \$68 billion in surplus funds. Outside those trust funds, the federal government ran a deficit of \$386 billion. The Congressional Budget Office reported that fiscal year 2002 had the largest percentage decrease in revenues in 56 years and the largest percentage increase in spending in 20 years.

We spend almost one billion dollars per day on interest. The Treasury spent \$332.5 billion on interest on the debt in fiscal year 2002. Military spending totaled \$332.1 billion, slightly less than the interest expense, despite a 14 percent increase to fight the war on terrorism. Medicare spending totaled \$256 billion, \$77 billion less than we spent on interest.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes just to show my colleague from Mississippi, who does care about this; I do not begrudge him that at all. I just want to let him know that I also share in the concern over debt. But since he was slightly partisan about the issue, let me show my colleagues my chart that shows the difference between what the Democratic Congresses did versus the Republican Congresses.

We were the ones who paid down the national debt by almost half a trillion dollars until we hit this last crisis in 2001 involving the economy, involving the emergency spending, involving what happened with homeland security. Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues want to raise it to a partisan level of whose debt is whose, I can show my colleagues a chart that compares with the gentleman's partisan chart.

What I would rather do is say, look, we are in this together now. I can show a chart that goes back to Reagan. I can show a chart that goes back to Clinton. We can have a history lesson here all day long. We can yell and scream and point fingers at who did what.

Look, we are in a mess. My colleagues did not do it; I did not do it. I mean, there are three huge factors. We had emergency spending that no one, no one would have ever anticipated. What a huge economic sucker gut punch as a result of a recession that was made worse after 2001 and the terrorist attacks. Was there a component part of that of reducing taxes? Yes. We disagree. We deliberately reduced taxes at a time of huge surpluses because, yes, we were paying off the national debt, paid off over a half a trillion dollars of national debt.

So if my colleagues want to come down and point fingers and talk about the past, I can show my colleagues Reagan charts and Clinton charts and things like that.

I think we should talk about the future and what we are going to do about it. The Democrats have a plan. I compliment that plan, even though I disagree with it, because it does begin to address those issues. I have what we believe is a better plan. But let us talk about our plan and let us look forward. If my colleagues want to continue to point fingers on how we got here, my colleagues can take up the time for the substitute to do just that, but I believe we ought to focus on the future and what we are going to do about it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, America is at war, and the Blue Dog budget reflects this new reality.

Our plan strengthens national defense, improves homeland security, all in the context of a responsible budget.

I have always tried to support my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when they were right, but today their budget is all wrong.

In an effort to squeeze the President's tax cut package into their budget, our Republican colleagues have proposed spending levels below the President's that are highly unlikely to be attainable in the current climate of war and the need to protect the homeland from terrorism. And even after cutting the President's budget, the Republican budget continues to dig the deficit hole deeper, saddling the taxpayers of this country with a national debt of over \$11.5 trillion in 2013. That is an increase of \$5.1 trillion in debt in the next 10 years. That means every American taxpayer will owe approximately \$5,100 every year just to pay the interest on the national debt. That is a debt tax that cannot be repealed.

In contrast, the Blue Dog budget is a realistic effort to control runaway Federal spending. It adopts the spending recommendations of our President. The Republican budget, on the other hand, turns its back on their own President's spending recommendations for veterans benefits, Medicare, Social Security, agriculture, and education.

The Blue Dog budget puts us back on a path to a unified balance by 2009 and restores the Social Security lockbox by 2013, a very significant year, because in that year, for the first time, the Social Security Administration projects that our government will begin paying out more each month in benefits than we received in payroll taxes.

By contrast, the Republican budget never restores the Social Security lockbox, turning their back on a promise made to America's seniors.

Since the Blue Dog budget adopts the total spending levels in the President's budget, my colleagues may be asking, what does the Blue Dog budget do differently than the Republican budget? It differs in one significant respect. It recognizes that long-term national security requires long-term fiscal responsibility. No nation has ever been strong and broke.

When our budget policies show that our current tax and spending plans will lead our Nation to ever-increasing debt, we are weakening our ability to respond to national security threats. At this very moment, while young men and women in uniform are courageously fighting the enemy in the deserts of Iraq, we are charging the financial cost of the war to the Federal Government's credit card. Who in this Chamber can explain to the American people why we are charging the cost of this war to the very generation that is now fighting this war? The Blue Dogs believe our generation should pay for this war.

Our Republican friends say, deficits no longer matter, and tax cuts will stimulate the economy, and tax revenues will return. We tried that in 2001 and what did we get? We saw the economy decline and a \$5 trillion surplus disappear into thin air.

The Blue Dogs invite our Republican friends not to bet the whole farm on an ideologically driven supply-side economic theory, but join us in accelerating the marginal tax relief, accelerating the child tax credit, accelerating the elimination of the marriage penalty; but in the name of fiscal responsibility and national security, we should not accelerate the tax cuts for those families who have over \$170,000 a year in income. Surely the top 3 percent of America's families will be proud to share in the patriotism of making this small sacrifice as those young men and women are doing in Iraq today.

We know that we should not ask those men and women in uniform to pay for the war we have called on them to fight. I invite all true fiscal conservatives to support the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time. I will be very brief.

I have a great deal of admiration for the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the committee. He has brought a budget resolution to the floor that his leadership has allowed him to bring, and they think they can get 218 votes out of the Republican caucus. What is wrong with that? I will tell my colleagues what is wrong with that and what the American people will say is wrong with that, and that is that the American people expect this Congress to set its priorities and to pay for those priorities, and that is something that we have been unwilling to do in the last couple of years.

What do I mean by that? It means that we have to have discipline on the spending side. We had that in 1997 when we, in a bipartisan way, sat down with the administration, which was in Democratic hands, and we sat down with the Republican-controlled Senate and House and made an agreement to set spending caps, and we made an

agreement to get this budget into balance by 2003, and we did it 3 years ahead of schedule.

So I would encourage my colleagues to vote for the Blue Dog budget and reject the Republican budget.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time.

I want to announce and show the audience here in the Chamber that the Concord Coalition, which is a national watchdog organization on the budget, issued a press statement today; and I want to just quote briefly from that:

"The Blue Dog budget does the best job of balancing short term concerns with long term fiscal discipline. The Blue Dog budget is clearly superior to the alternatives. It strikes a prudent balance among competing priorities by restraining spending and limiting newer expanded tax cuts to those that have an immediate impact and minimum long term cost."

□ 1800

I hope we will set aside partisanship and listen to a respected, objective organization, the national coalition, and approve the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman Nussle) for his commitment to providing a balanced budget and for acknowledging that debt and deficits do matter.

The Committee on the Budget passed a budget last week on a party line vote. At least it was an honest budget. It said that in order for us to pass huge tax cuts when we are already projecting deficits as far as the eye can see, we must pass spending cuts. In deference to Mr. Chairman over here, he would say, find savings in all functions of government. So please understand it that way.

Over \$100 billion below the President's request for discretionary spending, \$262 billion in Medicare cuts are finding savings, \$110 billion in Medicaid cuts are savings, \$19 billion in agriculture cuts are savings, \$39 billion in government employees' pensions, and \$15 billion in veterans benefits at a time that we are going to war, when our domestic security is threatened and our States and local governments are in financial crisis. That is the problem with this budget, Mr. Chairman: The reductions proposed simply are not reality.

Everyone here remembers last year's appropriations process. We just completed it last month. Congress ended up spending, or appropriating, \$12 billion more than the President's recommended levels. This budget proposes cuts in the President's austere request. This budget, simply for that reason, I believe, with all respect to the chairman and the committee, is not reality.

Look at what has happened the last weeks. In the face of an outright revolt

on many of these cuts, what did the majority do? They restored some of the so-called spending cuts, or savings, that were found, about \$200 billion in Medicare over 10 years. That is what is going to happen more and more. That is why I believe we simply cannot meet the spending levels proposed, with all respect, by the majority's budget.

This budget, because of its emphasis on tax cuts, never, I repeat, never, gets us to on-budget balance. Instead, it increases gross debt by over \$5 trillion over the next 10 years. The structural deficits in this budget, Mr. Chairman, will explode gross interest payments to \$3.8 trillion during the next decade. Interest, as has already been mentioned, it is the most wasteful spending we have because it commits our future generations in this country, our children and grandchildren, to paying something, a tax, what we call a debt tax.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) indicated that Senator DOLE called this a stealth tax. We call it a debt tax. It is a tax that can never be repealed because it is the interest of service on the national debt.

The Blue Dog budget cuts taxes. It provides an income tax cut for all taxpayers. It immediately eliminates the marriage penalty, accelerates the child tax credit, and on and on. Listen to the Concord Coalition, the objective voice here, endorsing the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the budget of the Blue Dogs, which I think handles our short-term needs and our long-term concerns.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Iowa for his hard work on the committee, and to thank him for allowing the Blue Dogs to make this presentation here today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I have waited 24 years for this day to shuck the tax-and-spend Democratic label and transfer it to the Republican borrow-and-spend label. I say this with a smile on my face, and I am one of those that believe when I am pointing the finger of partisanship, there are always three pointing back at me. I will take the three best shots of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), but I insist the gentleman takes my one at this time.

The gentleman said we have a difference between our two philosophies today. This chart shows it. Our budget

is the green budget. The yellow budget I ran against in 1978 because I thought deficit spending was bad. I voted for the Reagan tax cuts; and this is what we got, following the same economic theory that we once again are being asked to support today.

I am for the green. The Blue Dog budget will accomplish that based on the estimates. The gentleman's budget today will keep us in Social Security for the remainder of the 10 years the gentleman is talking about.

I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) did. The budget he brought out of committee was an honest budget. It told this conference and this Congress and the American people that if they want tax cuts, they have to pay for them. They have got to do the spending cuts that they suggested.

However, the gentleman's own conference said, no. As I told the gentleman privately, and I will say publicly, if the gentleman would reconcile the cuts in a public manner on this floor first and then go to the tax cuts, he would have some support on this side. But I am skeptical, when they bring a budget that even their own conference will not support to the floor on the spending cuts, but yet we are going to have a tax cut on the floor in a very short period of time, that this is what we are going to get.

Our budget balances without using Social Security by 2013. As the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) said a moment ago, it is immoral what this Congress, these last few Congresses, are doing to our children and grandchildren.

When we talk about spending cuts, I have heard it explained that in the agricultural function it is just 1 percent. But let me remind all of us, we took 2 years writing the farm bill that passed with two-thirds support, equally divided Democrats and Republicans, and the President signed it. We stayed within the budget that they asked us to last year.

Anyone that suggests we can make the cuts that the gentleman is suggesting, assuming that it passes, without reopening the farm bill and rewriting it, is totally misinformed as to what the facts are regarding the authorizing of various programs.

I find it very interesting that today in the Committee on the Judiciary we were supposed to have passing out a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. As many know, I am for it. I am a cosponsor of it. One of the happiest days in my life was when we passed it on this floor; one of the saddest days was when it went down by one vote in the Senate.

Had that passed in the Senate, they could not bring their budget to the floor today. The only budget we will vote on today is this budget right here, the blue one, the Blue Dog line, that shows that we will balance without using Social Security in 2013. They

could not do it had we had a constitutional restraint. Yet some on the gentleman's side have the audacity to suggest that the budget is a good one; but yet we want to have a constitutional amendment to require us to do what we are not willing to do when we have a chance of doing it.

In 1999 the Republican leadership issued a statement pledging to protect the Social Security surplus: "As leaders of the House of Representatives, we will not schedule any legislation that spends one penny of the Social Security trust fund. This leadership is committed to ending the 30-year raid on seniors and paying down the debt."

We could not help 9-11-01, and we cannot help the fact that our economy has gone south, but we can stop digging the hole deeper as of today. That is what the Blue Dog budget does. It is the only budget that stops digging the hole deeper.

Now, one area we cut below the President, and our spending levels, I repeat, in this budget we do not spend one penny more than President Bush asked us to spend, one penny; but there is one area we want to cut below the President. We want to cut \$420 billion out of the President's budget and somewhat less out of the chairman's budget for interest on the national debt. They can bring out all of the blue books, they have been there when the gentleman's party has been in charge, and some of us on this side would like to work with them. But they constantly and consistently deny us that opportunity, which, if they pass their budget today, once again, they deny us the opportunity.

We had a better budget 2 years ago. The economic situation of this country would not be as bad. I ask Members to support the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman, Mr. Chairman. I have enormous respect for the gentleman from Texas and for my friends for writing a budget, because writing a budget in Washington, D.C. for the Federal Government is not maybe the most challenging job in Washington, but it does have its moments of challenges.

Probably one of the biggest challenges in writing a budget, as my friends know, is when we have to explain to politicians who get elected by saying yes that sometimes we have to say no, or sometimes we have to do things that are difficult.

There is no question that when I wrote the original draft of this budget, I asked my colleagues to do something that was difficult. It maybe was more difficult than I had either the right to ask or the ability to ask; but I asked it, not because I thought it was easy, but because I thought it was important for us to at least begin the debate.

Particularly in Medicare, that is a debate that I recognize probably as being difficult maybe more than most Members because I have spent the last

12 years being stung by attacks from opponents back home who, in years where we did nothing to Medicare, were able to come up with phantom votes here and there suggesting that somehow, again, as a Republican, I think maybe just because I registered to vote as a Republican, that somehow I was cutting Medicare. It must be something that is just automatic when you become a Republican, it seems, these days.

But it could not be further from the truth. When it comes to our budgets in Medicare and so many of these programs, as my friends know, particularly since 1998, we have just been spending money around here like it is going out of style in every category. We almost cannot name a category that has gone down by any significant portion over the last 5 years, in particular, since we got the balance.

So it was not so much that I was saying cut, but I was saying slow down. That is all I was trying to say was slow down. That is what I was trying to say in Medicare was slow down. We had put \$400 billion in. I asked them to look for that waste within Medicare. We know it is there. I have three great examples that came out of those blue books we were talking about.

The Medicare program pays as much as eight times, just think about this, I would say to my friends, eight times the cost of any other Federal agency when we pay for the same drugs and medical supplies. I do not know, maybe double would be a reasonable level; but eight times does not make much sense to me.

Medicare provides overpayments of \$12.1 billion in 1 year. All right? That is just another example.

In 2002, it was estimated that improper, and that is in addition to overpayments, we are talking about just plain improper, fraudulent payments under Medicare were estimated at \$13 billion. Let me quickly do the math: 13, 12, that is 25. We do not even know what the cost of the drugs are, but that is \$25 billion in 1 year, as an example.

I do not know about the other Members, but that pays for a lot of prescription drugs for seniors. Just in the first year of the drug benefit that almost all of us support, we are only talking about \$7 billion as a drug benefit. That is just the first year of the phase-in. That is three times, almost four times, the amount of the initial drug benefit we waste in the Medicare program. That is before we even talk about reimbursements.

My friend, the gentleman from Texas, and I have been laboring on the Rural Health Care Coalition since I think the day the gentleman walked in this place, and certainly the day I walked in. Medicare is not serving our seniors because of a crazy reimbursement system that has been out there. But we come down here to the well and we say, oh, gosh, do not touch that, it is Medicare.

Heaven forbid we would try and do something around here in any of these

programs in order to try to control them, because around here in Washington our level of compassion and concern has been equal to the amount of money we are willing to put into the program.

So instead of saying to Medicare, the Defense Department, agriculture, I do not care what it is, instead of saying, where did that \$13 billion go; we are not going to give it to you again next year until you find it, instead, what we say is, oh, quick, quick, let us pass a budget that puts in \$400 billion more.

Let us hurry up and do that because heaven forbid we would look at a senior citizen straight in the eye and say, Do you know what? The program is not working as well as it should. It is not doing the job we promised; it is wasting money.

So that is what I was asking for. The gentleman is right, I did not get the votes for that. We will live to have that discussion another day because my guess is that in order for the actual bill to come to the floor, we are going to have to make some of those adjustments.

I could go on. That is the most politically sensitive one in the bunch. I could go on and on through less politically sensitive issues. But what I am asking us to do, and it is article 1 of the Constitution that I believe gives us that responsibility. The gentleman showed a chart that defines it by President. I could show a chart, and I know we are talking about the partisan jabs, I could show a chart that showed the exact same figures but showed them under Republican and Democratic Congresses.

□ 1815

It does not matter, as I said to my friend from Mississippi, it does not matter what happened in the past. It matters what we look to do in the future. My colleagues have got a plan. We disagree with it because it does not, we do not believe, do the one thing that we believe can help us here the most, and that is stimulate the growth in the economy that brings in so much of the revenue that we need.

The second thing it really does not do, and we disagree with the President on this, mostly not because we disagree with the President, but because it is our job to control spending. If we do not do it by the time the bill gets to his desk, it is not going to get done, and so that is why we asked for the waste, fraud and abuse within these reconciliation instructions.

Last but not least, and I think my friend wants us to yield, the balanced budget amendment, and I am a cosponsor and have been and voted for it. The one problem with a balanced budget amendment, of course, is it takes about 8 years to get it into place, and what we said in 1995 and what we are both saying here today in a bipartisan way, regardless of our plan, let us just do it. Forget about the amendment for a second. Let us do it. Let us actually go in

and balance it as opposed to just saying that we ought to have a constitutional amendment to do it.

The one thing the balanced budget amendment does provide is an exception. Two things actually. One is national emergency, and certainly I think September 11, obviously we in a bipartisan way agree that that is a national emergency; and the second is war, and clearly, we are in a war. So while I support that, I think we ought to just do it.

We put ourselves on a path under both of our plans, but we believe ours is a better path, and that is the reason.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I would just say there are 35 Blue Dogs that stand ready to work with the gentleman's side on every one of the issues in the blue books that my colleague had up. If we would have the same spirit on those issues that we have had by allowing us to have this 1 hour this year, which we were not allowed to have last year, we would have made a lot of progress on this.

The fact that my colleagues were kind enough this year to allow the Blue Dogs to have 1 hour of debate so we can have this discussion, we do think it is a better plan, but it is up to the will of the majority of the House as to whether our plan is better than my colleagues. We will stand by the will of the majority.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his comments.

As I say, I respectfully oppose the gentleman's and the Blue Dogs' substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 254, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

AYES—174

Abercrombie	Bono	Cramer
Ackerman	Boswell	Crowley
Alexander	Boyd	Cummings
Andrews	Brown (OH)	Davis (CA)
Baca	Brown, Corrine	Davis (FL)
Baird	Capps	Davis (IL)
Ballance	Cardin	Davis (TN)
Becerra	Cardoza	DeFazio
Bereuter	Carson (IN)	DeGette
Berkley	Case	Delahunt
Berman	Clay	DeLauro
Berry	Clyburn	Deutsch
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Dingell
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Doggett
Blumenauer	Costello	Dooley (CA)

Doyle	Langevin	Ross
Edwards	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Emanuel	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Emerson	Levin	Rush
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Eshoo	Lipinski	Sanchez, Linda
Etheridge	Lofgren	T.
Farr	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Fattah	Majette	Sandlin
Filner	Maloney	Schakowsky
Ford	Markley	Schiff
Frank (MA)	Marshall	Scott (GA)
Frost	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Gonzalez	McCarthy (MO)	Serrano
Gordon	McCarthy (NY)	Sherman
Green (TX)	McCollum	Shimkus
Grijalva	McGovern	Simpson
Gutierrez	McIntyre	Slaughter
Gutknecht	McNulty	Smith (MI)
Hall	Meehan	Snyder
Harman	Meek (FL)	Solis
Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Spratt
Hayes	Menendez	Stark
Hill	Michaud	Stenholm
Hinchey	Millender-	Tanner
Holden	McDonald	Tauscher
Holt	Miller, George	Taylor (MS)
Honda	Moore	Thompson (CA)
Hooley (OR)	Moran (VA)	Thompson (MS)
Hoyer	Nadler	Tierney
Inslee	Napolitano	Towns
Israel	Neal (MA)	Turner (TX)
Jackson-Lee	Olver	Udall (NM)
(TX)	Ortiz	Van Hollen
Jefferson	Pallone	Velazquez
John	Pascrell	Visclosky
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor	Wamp
Jones (OH)	Pelosi	Waters
Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	Watson
Kaptur	Pomeroy	Watt
Kilpatrick	Price (NC)	Waxman
Kind	Rangel	Weiner
LaHood	Reyes	Wu
Lampson	Rodriguez	Wynn

NOES—254

Aderholt	Culberson	Hostettler
Akin	Cunningham	Houghton
Allen	Davis (AL)	Hulshof
Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Hunter
Baker	Davis, Tom	Isakson
Baldwin	Deal (GA)	Issa
Ballenger	DeLay	Istook
Barrett (SC)	DeMint	Jackson (IL)
Bartlett (MD)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Janklow
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jenkins
Bass	Dicks	Johnson (CT)
Beauprez	Doolittle	Johnson (IL)
Bell	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Biggart	Duncan	Jones (NC)
Bilirakis	Dunn	Keller
Bishop (UT)	Ehlers	Kelly
Blackburn	English	Kennedy (MN)
Blunt	Evans	Kennedy (RI)
Boehlert	Everett	Kildee
Boehner	Feeney	King (IA)
Bonilla	Ferguson	King (NY)
Bonner	Flake	Kingston
Boozman	Fletcher	Kirk
Boucher	Foley	Kleczka
Bradley (NH)	Forbes	Kline
Brady (PA)	Fossella	Knollenberg
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Kolbe
Brown (SC)	Frelinghuysen	Kucinich
Brown-Waite,	Galleghy	Lantos
Ginny	Garrett (NJ)	Latham
Burgess	Gerlach	LaTourette
Burns	Gibbons	Leach
Burr	Gilchrest	Lee
Burton (IN)	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Calvert	Gingrey	Lewis (KY)
Camp	Goode	Linder
Cannon	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Cantor	Goss	Lowe
Capito	Granger	Lucas (KY)
Capuano	Graves	Lucas (OK)
Carson (OK)	Green (WI)	Manzullo
Carter	Greenwood	Matheson
Castle	Harris	McCotter
Chabot	Hart	McCrery
Chocola	Hastings (WA)	McDermott
Coble	Hayworth	McHugh
Cole	Hefley	McInnis
Collins	Hensarling	McKeon
Combest	Herger	Mica
Cox	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)
Crane	Hobson	Miller (MI)
Crenshaw	Hoeffel	Miller (NC)
Cubin	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary

Mollohan	Putnam	Smith (WA)
Moran (KS)	Quinn	Souder
Murphy	Radanovich	Stearns
Murtha	Rahall	Strickland
Musgrave	Ramstad	Stupak
Myrick	Regula	Sullivan
Nethercutt	Rehberg	Sweeney
Ney	Renzi	Tancred
Northup	Rogers (AL)	Tauzin
Norwood	Rogers (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Nunes	Rogers (MI)	Terry
Nussle	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Oberstar	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiahrt
Obey	Rothman	Tiberi
Osborne	Royce	Toomey
Ose	Ryan (WI)	Turner (OH)
Otter	Ryun (KS)	Upton
Owens	Sabo	Vitter
Oxley	Sanders	Walden (OR)
Paul	Saxton	Walsh
Payne	Schrock	Weldon (FL)
Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (PA)
Pence	Sessions	Weller
Peterson (PA)	Shadeegg	Wexler
Petri	Shaw	Whitfield
Pickering	Shays	Wicker
Pitts	Sherwood	Wilson (NM)
Platts	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Pombo	Simmons	Wolf
Porter	Skelton	Woolsey
Portman	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Buyer	Hyde	Thornberry
Gephardt	Reynolds	Udall (CO)

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) (during the vote). The Chair advises Members there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1838

Messrs. EVERETT, TURNER of Ohio, FRANKS of Arizona, FERGUSON, ENGLISH and GILCHREST changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. GUTIERREZ, EDWARDS, COSTELLO and Mrs. BONO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, on House rollcall vote 78, on the Hill Substitute to H. Con. Res. 95, I mistakenly cast my vote as a "no". I intended to vote "aye" and support the Hill substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 108-44.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. TOOMEY

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 2 in the Nature of a Substitute offered by Mr. TOOMEY:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2013.

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For the purpose of enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal Year 2003: \$1,323,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,340,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,504,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,642,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,768,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,872,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$1,985,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,095,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,198,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,324,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,460,635,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$36,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$126,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$112,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$97,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$85,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$90,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$92,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$97,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$228,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$325,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$343,575,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,790,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,811,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,888,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,961,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,019,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,072,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,144,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,209,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,297,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,371,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,463,897,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,776,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,824,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,880,352,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,931,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,979,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,033,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,110,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,178,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,272,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,333,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,433,558,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$453,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$484,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$376,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$288,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$211,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$161,184,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$124,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$82,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$73,988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$8,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$—27,077,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$6,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$7,242,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$7,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$8,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$8,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$9,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$9,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$9,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$10,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$10,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$11,010,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$3,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$4,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$4,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$4,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$4,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$4,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$4,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$4,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$4,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$4,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$4,364,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$392,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$386,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$400,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$400,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$420,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$414,237,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$440,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$426,011,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$460,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$438,656,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$480,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$462,861,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$494,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$480,650,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$507,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$497,348,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$522,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$516,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$536,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$523,884,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$551,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$543,541,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,676,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,128,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,608,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,409,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,389,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$29,398,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,221,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,065,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,873,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,737,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,556,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,348,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,082,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,690,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,425,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,127,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,799,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,435,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,079,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,735,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,393,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$439,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$929,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$962,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,245,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,023,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,402,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,663,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,784,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,182,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,957,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,319,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,295,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,940,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$29,866,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,250,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,199,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$35,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$35,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,590,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,144,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,113,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,035,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,066,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,388,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$8,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$5,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$7,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$8,633,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$8,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$8,628,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$8,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$8,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$8,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,840,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$67,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$65,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$73,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$65,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$68,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$67,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$68,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$68,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$68,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$71,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$71,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$72,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$72,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$74,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$74,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$76,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,924,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,923,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,990,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,288,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$86,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$84,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$85,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$84,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$83,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$86,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$84,632,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$88,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$86,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$90,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$88,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$92,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$90,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$93,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$92,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$95,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$93,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$97,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$95,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$99,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$97,583,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$221,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$218,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$235,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$235,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$248,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$248,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$265,324,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$264,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$284,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$283,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$303,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$302,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$323,793,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$322,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$345,221,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$343,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$370,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$368,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$394,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$393,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$423,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$421,858,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$248,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$248,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$261,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$261,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$275,475,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$278,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$312,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$309,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$332,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$332,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$352,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$352,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$372,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$371,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$392,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$392,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$420,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$423,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$453,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$450,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$490,497,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$490,754,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$326,588,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$334,373,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$315,939,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$321,576,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$326,452,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$329,892,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$332,440,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$334,883,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$337,235,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$339,157,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$345,904,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$347,149,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$354,493,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$355,411,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$362,278,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$363,059,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$376,326,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$377,070,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$379,667,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$380,403,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$393,564,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$394,420,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,255,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,255,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,223,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,222,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,330,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,330,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,451,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,451,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,975,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,975,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,827,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,827,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,982,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,982,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,357,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,357,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,235,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,235,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,450,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,481,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,481,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,597,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,486,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,710,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,692,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,827,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,329,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,976,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,720,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,320,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,014,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,655,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,502,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,888,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,644,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,158,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,874,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,646,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,350,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,805,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,416,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,452,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$74,132,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,543,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,712,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,310,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,895,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,673,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,003,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,581,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,026,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,963,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,859,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,880,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,633,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,839,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,662,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,884,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,696,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,152,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,847,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,451,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,124,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,464,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,178,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,103,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,768,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,586,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,025,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,213,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,654,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,713,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,955,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,716,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,760,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,552,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,168,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,761,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,572,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,127,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,294,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,826,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,039,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,829,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,323,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$239,741,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$239,741,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$256,367,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$256,367,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$301,918,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$301,918,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$336,172,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$336,172,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$355,442,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$355,442,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$368,985,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$368,985,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$379,976,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$379,976,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$387,382,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$387,382,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$394,728,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$394,728,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$401,288,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$401,288,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$403,084,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$403,084,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$25,986,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,781,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$58,705,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$61,030,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$103,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$106,165,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$134,939,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$137,938,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$172,108,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$174,839,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$184,626,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$187,639,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$197,329,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$200,631,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$213,132,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$216,854,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$227,647,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$230,847,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$244,708,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$248,504,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$41,104,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$41,104,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$42,894,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$42,894,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$52,598,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$52,598,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$54,459,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$54,459,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$51,535,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$51,535,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, —\$53,540,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$53,540,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$52,609,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$52,609,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$54,685,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$54,685,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$56,841,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$56,841,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$59,025,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$59,025,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$61,229,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$61,229,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TAX SIMPLIFICATION AND FAIRNESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 11, 2003, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to—

(1) reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: \$35,420,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$126,232,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$512,195,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$1,599,943,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013; and

(2) increase the level of direct spending for that committee by \$4,380,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003, \$1,111,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$17,393,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$23,096,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the level of direct spending for that committee by \$3,600,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 and outlays flowing therefrom.

(b) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 18, 2003, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$1,409,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$17,622,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$50,718,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$613,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$8,276,000,000 in outlays

for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$25,665,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$3,160,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$80,495,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$292,506,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$30,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004, \$390,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$381,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(E) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The House Committee on Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$2,518,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$33,042,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$104,405,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(F) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—The House Committee on House Administration shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$11,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$87,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$241,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(G) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.—The House Committee on International Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$367,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$4,124,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$12,183,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(H) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$201,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$2,317,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$6,548,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(I) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$91,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$1,095,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$3,008,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(J) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE.—The House Committee on Science shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$2,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$19,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$40,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(K) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—The House Committee on Small Business shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to re-

duce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$0 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$0 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$0 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(L) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$438,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$5,563,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$16,104,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(M) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$1,056,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$13,449,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$39,848,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(N) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$8,514,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$73,579,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$292,553,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds for Legislation Assumed in Budget Aggregates

SEC. 301. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID.

In the House, if the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that—

(1) modernizes medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), and

(2) reduces new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom by \$9,010,000,000 for fiscal years 2009 through 2013,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase allocations of new budget authority and outlays for that committee (and make other appropriate changes in budgetary aggregates) by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$3,258,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2004 and \$8,944,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008.

SEC. 302. RESERVE FUND FOR BIOSHIELD.

In the House, if the appropriate committee of jurisdiction reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes a program to accelerate the research, development, and purchase of biomedical threat countermeasures and—

(1) such measure provides new budget authority to carry out such program; or

(2) such measure authorizes discretionary new budget authority to carry out such program and the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution that provides new budget authority to carry out such program,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations for the committee providing such new budget authority, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, by the amount provided for that purpose, but, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (1), not to exceed \$890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and

outlays flowing therefrom and \$3,418,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom or, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (2), not to exceed \$890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the total such revision for fiscal year 2004 may not exceed \$890,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 303. RESERVE FUND FOR RETIREMENT SECURITY.

Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that enhances retirement security through structural programmatic reform and the creation of personal retirement accounts, provided that such accounts are funded from the taxes currently collected for the purpose of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Program, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may—

- (1) increase the appropriate allocations and aggregates of new budget authority and outlays by the amount of new budget authority provided by such measure (and outlays flowing therefrom) for that purpose;
- (2) reduce the revenue aggregates by the amount of the revenue loss resulting from that measure for that purpose; and
- (3) make all other appropriate and conforming adjustments.

Subtitle B—Implementation of Reserve Funds

SEC. 311. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

- (1) apply while that measure is under consideration;
- (2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and
- (3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

- (1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and
- (2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE HOUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2005 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory

statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading "Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations" in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$23,178,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "advance appropriation" means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2004 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2004.

SEC. 402. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 403. ACTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 302(b)(1) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.

(a) COMPLIANCE.—When complying with Section 302(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee on Appropriations of each House shall consult with the Committee on Appropriations of the other House to ensure that the allocation of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees are identical.

(b) REPORT.—The Committee on Appropriations of each House shall report to its House when it determines that the report made by the Committee pursuant to Section 301(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the report made by the Committee on Appropriations of the other House pursuant to the same provision contain identical allocations of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees.

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report providing new discretionary budget authority for Fiscal Year 2004 allocated to the Committee on Appropriations unless and until the Committee on Appropriations of that House has made the report required under paragraph (b) of this Section.

SEC. 404. CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES RESULTING FROM REALISTIC SCORING OF MEASURES AFFECTING REVENUES.

(a) Whenever the House considers a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report, including measures filed in compliance with Section 4 of this Concurrent Resolution, that propose to change federal revenues the impact of such measure on federal revenues shall be calculated by the Joint Committee on Taxation in a manner that takes into account:

(1) the impact of the proposed revenue changes on:

- i. Gross Domestic Product, including the growth rate for the Gross Domestic Product;
- ii. Total Domestic Employment;
- iii. Gross Private Domestic Investment;
- iv. General Price Index;
- v. Interest Rates; and
- vi. Other economic variables

(2) the impact on Federal Revenue of the changes in economic variables analyzed under subpart (1) of this paragraph.

(b) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make any necessary changes to allocations and aggregates in order to conform this Concurrent Resolution with the determinations made by the Joint Committee on Taxation pursuant to paragraph (a) of this Section.

SEC. 405. PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 201(a) OF THIS CONCURRENT RESOLUTION.

When reporting to the House reconciliation measures in compliance with Section 201(a) of this Concurrent Resolution, the Ways and Means Committee shall not report legislation, which:

(1) proposes to provide a graduated or phased-in reduction over time in:

- (a) Individual income tax rates,
- (b) Corporate tax rates, or

(c) The rate of taxes collected on the proceeds from investments, including taxes collected on capital gains; or

(2) conditions any changes in tax law upon the achievement of some level of:

- (a) Federal Revenue,
- (b) Federal Surplus, or
- (c) Level of Public Debt.

SEC. 406. PROHIBITION ON USING REVENUE INCREASES TO COMPLY WITH BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) For the purpose of enforcing this Concurrent Resolution in the House, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall not take into account the provisions of any piece of legislation which propose to increase revenue or offsetting collections if the net effect of the bill is to increase the level of revenue or offsetting collections beyond the level assumed in this Concurrent Resolution.

(b) Paragraph (a) of this Section shall not apply to any provision of a piece of legislation that proposes a new or increased fee for the receipt of a defined benefit or service (including insurance coverage) by the person or entity paying the fee.

SEC. 407. CRITERIA FOR ADJUSTMENTS TO ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES FROM USE OF THE "EMERGENCY" DESIGNATION.

(A) GUIDANCE.—In making a designation of a provision of legislation as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets the definition of an "emergency" set out in paragraph (b) of this Section.

(b) The term "emergency" means a situation that—

(1) requires new budget authority and outlays (or new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom) for the preventions or mitigation of, or response to, loss of life or property, or a threat to national security; and

(2) is unanticipated, which means that the underlying situation is sudden, urgent, unforeseen, and temporary.

(c) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, or conference report that contains an emergency designation under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 unless the proposed emergency requirement meets the definition of an "emergency" set out in paragraph (b) of this Section.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (c) of this section.

(e) DISPOSITION OF POINTS OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.—As disposition of a point of order under paragraph (c) or paragraph (d) of this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the point of order. A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent of the point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

(f) EFFECT ON AMENDMENT IN ORDER AS ORIGINAL TEXT IN THE HOUSE.—The disposition of the question of consideration under this section with respect to a bill or joint resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

TITLE V—SENSES OF CONGRESS

SEC. 501. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS TO ACHIEVE BUDGET GOALS.

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) The Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004 should achieve the following key goals:

(A) ensure adequate funding is available for essential government programs, in particular

(B) defense and homeland security;

(C) Foster greater economic growth and increased domestic employment by eliminating those provisions in the tax code (these provisions include, but are not limited to, the double taxation of corporate dividends, the taxation of capital gains, the limitations on expensing, the phased-in rather than immediate reduction of personal income tax rates, and the alternative minimum tax) that discourage economic growth and job creation;

(D) Bring the Federal budget back into balance as soon as possible; (2) The Federal Government spends billions of dollars each year on programs and projects that are of marginal value to the country as a whole. (3) Funding for these lower priority programs should be viewed in light of the goals of this Concurrent Resolution and whether or not continued funding of these programs advances or hinders the achievement of these goals.

(4) This Concurrent Resolution assumes that funding for many lower priority programs will be reduced or eliminated in order to increase funding for defense and homeland security while at the same time controlling overall spending.

(b) It is the Senate of Congress that the following programs should be eliminated:

(1) Title X Family Planning;

(2) Corporation for Public Broadcasting;

(3) National Endowment for the Arts;

(4) Legal Services Corporation; and

(5) Advanced Technology Program.

SEC. 502. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE ABOLISHMENT OF OBSOLETE AGENCIES AND THE FEDERAL SUNSET ACT OF 2003.

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) The National Commission on the Public Service's recent report, "Urgent Business For America: Revitalizing The Federal Government For The 21st Century," states that government missions are so widely dispersed among so many agencies that no coherent management is possible. The report also states that fragmentation leaves many gaps, inconsistencies, and inefficiencies in government oversight and results in an unacceptable level of public health protection.

(2) According to the Commission, there are: more than 35 food safety laws adminis-

tered by 12 different federal agencies; 541 clean air, water, and waste programs in 29 federal agencies; 50 different programs to aid the homeless in eight different federal agencies; and 27 teen pregnancy programs operated in nine federal agencies; and 90 early childhood programs scattered among 11 federal agencies.

(3) According to the General Accounting Office, there are 163 programs with a job training or employment function, 64 welfare programs of a similar nature, and more than 500 urban aid programs.

(4) GAO also indicates 13 agencies coordinate 342 economic development programs, but there is very little or no coordination between them. This situation had created a bureaucracy so complex that many local communities stop applying for economic assistance. At the same time, the General Accounting Office reports that these programs often serve as nothing more than funnels for pork, have "no significant effect" on the economy, and cost as much as \$307,000 to create each job.

(5) In 1976, Colorado became the first state to implement a sunset mechanism. Today, about half of the nation's states have some sort of sunset mechanism in effect to monitor their legislative branch agencies. On the Federal level, the United States Senate in 1978 overwhelmingly passed legislation to sunset most of the federal government agencies by a vote of 87-1.

(6) In Texas, "sunsetting" has eliminated 44 agencies and saved the taxpayers \$720 million compared with expenditures of \$16.94 million for the Sunset Commission. Based on these estimates, for every dollar spent on the Sunset process, the State has received about \$42.50 in return.

(b) It is the Sense of Congress that

The House of Representatives should adopt H.R. 1227, The Abolishment of Obsolete Agencies and Federal Sunset Act of 2003.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time in opposition be divided evenly between the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and myself.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I am completely agreeable. That procedure has been our custom and practice in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by commending the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for the outstanding work the gentleman has done. The gentleman has worked very hard. Our committee has worked very hard, and the budget is a good budget. But I believe the alternative budget that I

am going to describe right now and that the Republican Study Committee is putting forward is a better budget. I want to go over the highlights of the differences and engage in this discussion about the alternatives.

Let us look at the major differences. The big difference between the Republican Study Committee budget and the committee budget are three.

First, we provide more tax relief. We provide more tax relief than the committee budget does, we provide more tax relief than any of the alternative budgets do.

Number two, we actually cut some spending. Now the committee's budget cuts the rate of growth of spending. Our budget actually cuts nondefense, not homeland security discretionary spending.

The third thing is we run smaller deficits and we get back to a balanced budget faster than any other budget, including faster than the Blue Dog budget that we just heard a lot of discussion about. We do it in 4 years, faster than any other, and that is not accounting for the faster economic growth that would result from our budget package. Let me run through these three areas.

First on the tax front, we recognize in this budget that we are still overtaxed. The fact is that Federal taxes consume about 21 percent of national income, and total taxes from all government in our country is over a third of national income. This is well above the post-war average high. The fact is we are not undertaxed; we are still overtaxed. Many of our constituents are facing tax increases at the State and local levels. They need to have that off-set, and we can do that in our budget.

Our budget accommodates the President's entire growth package; and that is critical because we need to get this economy growing again, so we accommodate the elimination of the double taxation of dividends. This would end a great inequity in our tax system, a bias in our current code, a bias that, frankly, falls disproportionately on older Americans; and it would also stimulate economic growth.

□ 1845

If we follow the wisdom of the President's proposal and eliminate the double taxation on dividends, it has a number of positive effects for our economy. It would immediately result in higher equity prices, which is a good start. The current tax also increases the cost of capital. By lowering the cost of capital, we encourage capital formation. It also would reduce the current distortion of the allocation of capital. Abolishing the double taxation will over time release billions of dollars for more productive investment.

The bottom line is the President's proposal encourages saving and investment and capital formation, and that helps sustain economic growth. That is why we need to do it.

We also need to accelerate the phase-in of marginal tax rate reductions. When you lower marginal income tax rates, you increase the incentive to save and work and invest, and when you increase the incentives, you get more savings and work and investment. If we delay this any further, we just postpone the beneficial effects.

In our budget, we accommodate the President's entire tax relief package. Then we do something more. We do not specify exactly what that would have to be, but, Mr. Chairman, it would be large enough to accommodate a 50 percent reduction in capital gains rates, and that would also significantly encourage economic growth. That kind of capital formation is a precondition for strong economic growth.

On the spending side, as I said earlier, ours is the only budget that makes some real cuts in spending. On the discretionary side, we do not cut defense spending. We use the same number that the President has proposed and the same number that the committee has proposed. We recognize this obligation. We recognize that we are at war. We do not cut homeland security funding. On the mandatory spending side, we do not touch Social Security at all, we make no changes, and we do not actually cut anything in mandatory spending, although we do restrain the rate of growth. What we actually do cut is in nondefense, non-homeland security discretionary spending.

Why is it important to get this spending under control? Because, Mr. Chairman, total government spending is the real measure of the burden that the government imposes on our economy. More than deficits, more than the debt, it is the total amount of money that the government sucks out of the private sector, whether it does it by borrowing or whether it does it by confiscating people's money, that is the measure of the misallocation of capital. We all know there are a lot of vital programs that have to be funded, but on the margin we know that this spending occurs through a political process where Members are spending money to try to get reelected. It is not the allocation of capital that individual consumers and businesses would allocate for stronger economic growth.

The other problem with too much spending is the enormous waste. We have heard a discussion about that earlier, but the government cannot even account for over \$17 billion in spending in 2001. The Federal Government acknowledges \$20 billion in overpayments. The list of ridiculous misspent money, missing money, overpayments is a very long and a very embarrassing list, frankly. We are never going to wring that waste out of government until we impose some spending discipline.

The fact is government Federal spending, discretionary spending, total spending has been growing at several times the rate of inflation, and now is

the time to rein that in. If we cannot rein that in now, Mr. Chairman, when can we rein that in?

The net budgetary effects of our budget is greater tax relief, modest spending discipline, and as a result we run smaller deficits for shorter periods of time, and we get back to a balance faster than any other budget proposal.

I heard the Blue Dogs come down on this floor and talk about how much they want to balance this budget, how quickly they want to do that, why they want to do that. I am glad to hear that. I look forward to their voting for our budget because it gets to a balance faster than any others.

The other point I would make is that there can be no doubt that our combination of lower taxes and less spending would lead to stronger economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, let me start by commending the gentleman from Iowa. It is always a tough duty to try to carry a budget through the House.

I have a couple of questions. Can the chairman of the Committee on the Budget confirm that the reconciliation instructions clarify how the Committee on Government Reform will be credited with savings resulting from legislation that it submits to the Committee on the Budget?

Mr. NUSSLE. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Does this language ensure that the Committee on Government Reform will receive full credit for any savings it reports that are consistent with its reconciliation instructions?

Mr. NUSSLE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Can the gentleman confirm that the Committee on Government Reform may write legislation that also achieves significant savings in discretionary programs?

Mr. NUSSLE. That is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. And can the chairman also confirm that it is possible to meet the savings targets within the budget resolution without making any changes to Federal retirement annuities paid to participants in the Civil Service Retirement System, FERS, the Federal Employees Retirement System, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program?

Mr. NUSSLE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I thank the chairman for that clarification.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, my constituents find it very difficult to understand why at these times that we have

economic uncertainty, that we are at war, we have large deficits and we are considering a reckless new tax cut. This amendment is even worse than the underlying bill. I oppose the underlying budget, and I oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, budgets speak to choice. What is important? I am frustrated with this new proposition that every budget priority should take a back seat to tax cuts. What is more important, funding for homeland security or tax cuts? Fiscal responsibility or tax cuts? Protecting Social Security or tax cuts? Prescription drugs for our seniors or tax cuts? Adequate funding for veterans' health and disability benefits or tax cuts? Keeping children nutrition programs or tax cuts? Adequate funding for education or tax cuts?

At a time that we are facing large deficits, it seems to me that we could find a lot better use for \$1.3 trillion for tax cuts that primarily benefit the wealthy.

This plan digs a deeper hole in our Federal budget. We should treat the Federal budget with no less consideration than we would treat our own family home budget. This budget digs a deep hole in our Federal budget. It cuts vital programs that help the people in our society we have pledged to assist, our veterans, our children, our parents. It puts more pressure on our States and cities who are already under the fiscal gun, and it shows exactly the wrong kind of budget priorities.

Our budget should speak to our priorities. We must do better. We should approve the budget resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) that is more fiscally responsible, provides for a modest tax cut targeted to stimulate immediate growth in our economy, and provides adequate resources for prescription drugs for our seniors, education for our children, and homeland defense for all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Toomey amendment and the underlying budget resolution and support the Spratt amendment.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to lend my strong support to the Republican Study Committee budget. As chairman of the RSC, I am very proud of this budget that we have produced, and I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) for all his hard work on this. It reins in the astronomical spending increases we have had over the past few years and brings us back to balance in just 4 years. No other budget achieves balance as quickly as this one does.

When I came to Washington as part of the revolutionary class of 1995, we were determined and extremely serious to balance the budget and get us back on track, which we did. We were successful in doing that for the first few years, but lately we have presided over

some of the biggest increases in spending in U.S. history. In the last 7 years, nondefense discretionary spending has grown 66 percent. The fiscal year 2003 budget alone was a 9 percent increase in discretionary spending from the year before. I do not know of any family's budget in this country that has had the good fortune to increase 9 percent in 2003. So why should the Federal Government continue spending increases in this amount?

This RSC budget holds the government to responsible increases that will not grow faster than inflation or the family budget. Our budget proposal achieves a 1 percent savings by looking for waste, fraud and abuse and eliminating it from the Federal Government. That is only 1 penny out of every dollar. We hear folks continue to say it is impossible to find that amount of money, that amount of waste, in the government.

I would like Members to take a look at this chart. Thirty-five food safety laws administered by 12 different agencies; 541 clean air, water, waste programs; 50 programs for the homeless in 8 different Federal agencies; 163 different job training employment programs; 64 welfare programs; 500 urban aid. It goes on. You can see for yourself there is a lot there that could be simplified. Most estimates indicate there are tens of billions of dollars wasted every year. Last year alone, there were estimated to be \$13.3 billion in improper payments under Medicare.

It is time Congress gets serious about reining in wasteful spending and getting our budget under control. That is what we were sent here to do. That is what the American people expect us to do. They want us to stop the business as usual and stop the excuses.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HASTERT was allowed to speak out of order.)

NOTICE OF IRAQ WAR BRIEFINGS

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, for the information of all Members, I want to report that there will be two classified Members-only briefings regarding Iraq tonight and tomorrow. First, tonight, at 7:40 p.m., Secretary Rumsfeld will brief all Members in the Armed Services Committee hearing room located in 2118 of the Rayburn Office Building.

In addition, tomorrow, Friday, at 10:45 a.m., officials from the Department of Defense, the Department of State and the Joint Chiefs of Staff will provide this briefing also. This briefing will take place at the 2118 Rayburn location as well.

I encourage all Members to attend both these important briefings, tonight and tomorrow, so that they have the latest information prior to returning to their districts.

Members will be alerted to any further details via the e-mail whip notice system.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his hard work on the budget.

As the gentleman knows, the manager's amendment on the budget resolution includes reconciliation instructions to the Committee on Agriculture for savings in mandatory programs. To clarify for my colleagues and farmers and ranchers who follow this process, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget about the reconciliation instructions.

Mr. NUSSLE. If the gentleman will yield, I would be happy to respond.

Mr. OSBORNE. It is my understanding that the Committee on the Budget will work with the Committee on Agriculture to identify specific proposals that eliminate waste, fraud and inefficiencies so that any reductions do not come from farm programs and the crop insurance program. Is that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget's understanding?

Mr. NUSSLE. That is my understanding. The budget is intended to protect farm programs and the crop insurance program. Our committee will work with the chairman and other members of the Committee on Agriculture such as yourself to ensure that we protect critical farm programs and the crop insurance program. This includes an adequate funding level for programs authorized under last year's farm bill.

Mr. OSBORNE. I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Budget for his responses to my inquiries. As I understand what the chairman is saying, the Committee on Agriculture should look to eliminating waste, fraud and abuse, and that he will work to see that there are no reductions in the current farm program and crop insurance program other than those attributable to waste, fraud and abuse.

Mr. NUSSLE. The gentleman is correct. I appreciate his help and support in this endeavor.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would simply say that these colloquies we are hearing on the House floor indicate how difficult it is going to be to achieve the kind of reconciliation cuts that have been directed to various committees. We see the committee people coming out here and saying, You are not going to cut this, are you? You are not going to cut that, are you? You are not going to cut government pensions, for goodness sakes. We will correct the procurement system and save \$43 billion.

That is why I find it hard to take this budget at face value. I am sorry, but that is way I approach it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his leadership on this budget. I rise in opposition to the Toomey amendment. But before I do

that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to first offer my prayers and support for all of our brave soldiers currently serving in Iraq and the surrounding regions.

□ 1900

Mr. Chairman, the Toomey amendment would provide less discretionary spending than the Republican budget resolution, which means that his amendment would keep this Nation in deficit spending far past 2007. With respect to the underlying bill, our Nation is fighting an expensive war, the costs of which are yet unknown. Thus it is unconscionable that this body would take up a budget resolution that would propose cuts in key domestic programs.

According to the National Urban League, this budget resolution clearly shows how policy can affect the gap in black and white wealth accumulation. First, the biggest tax expenditure in the Federal Government is the deduction of health insurance. African Americans do not get access to this credit, as one third of African Americans get health insurance through Medicare. Thus this budget resolution on the House floor proposes to cut \$300 billion out of minority communities through Medicare cuts. Over the next 10 years, this budget resolution would cut also as much as \$470 billion in programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, education, and veterans benefits. In fact, the Republican Party's budget resolution drastically cuts domestic programs by \$244 billion below the amount needed to maintain the FY 2003 funding levels.

I believe we owe the American people that we must take care of their affordable health care needs, and I believe the Democratic substitute amendment and budget offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) does exactly that. My constituents want their benefits under Medicare and Medicaid protected. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) would increase the resources for homeland security and first responders.

I say vote for the Spratt amendment and vote "no" on the Republican budget.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond and correct what I think was a misstatement.

The fact is the cuts in spending in our Republican Study Committee budget did not result in larger deficits. They result in smaller deficits because we have got less spending, and that means less debt, and that means we get back into balance faster than any other budget that will be considered today; and I am looking forward to the enthusiastic support of the Blue Dogs, who feel very strongly about getting back into balance.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

And I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania on this for his work on this alternative budget, and I offer it my full support. It is said that we simply cannot cut anymore and that the Nussle budget that we have, a lot of people are saying it cuts too deeply. This is simply wrong. When we look across the board and we look at what we have done as Republicans, frankly, over the past 8 years, since 1996, the first year of the first Republican budget, we have increased spending for all cabinet agencies substantially, much more so than inflation. Inflation has been about 21 percent since 1996. The Agriculture Department has gone up 27.5 percent; Commerce, 40.2 percent; Energy, 34.4; HHS, 94.7; HUD, 52.6; Interior, 45 percent since 1996. The State Department has gone up 68 percent; Labor Department, 23.8; Defense Department, 43.7. And how about education? It is always said we do not spend enough on education. Try a 131.9 percent increase since 1996.

And we say we cannot cut anything. We say we cannot find waste, fraud, and abuse, 1 percent of it. Come on. Let us get serious. We just passed an omnibus bill a couple of weeks ago that had items like \$3.1 million for the Inventors Hall of Fame that I did not even know we had, or how about \$750,000 for the Baseball Hall of Fame? The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame got \$350,000. What are we doing? \$800,000 to the Grammy Foundation. That now is part of the baseline. We are adding to that and we keep adding and adding and adding. Where does it end? We have got to get some fiscal sanity, and that is what the Toomey budget does. This brings our budget back into balance faster than any other budget plan outlined, in 4 years.

We know that there is a lot of waste, fraud, and abuse out there. More than \$8 billion has gone out in erroneous earned income tax credit payments. There is mismanagement of over \$3 billion in the Bureau of Indian Affairs trust funds, over \$2 billion in erroneous food stamp payments. Two years ago there was over \$1 billion in unissued medical bills for Veterans Health Administration. The list goes on and on and on. We can cut more. We can actually give tax cuts and cut spending and come into balance much faster than the budget outlined by the Democrats and the Republicans in the majority. I urge support of the Toomey amendment, the Toomey plan.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before yielding to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), let me quote from a letter that was written to Speaker HASTERT by the head of the Paralyzed Veterans of America. He said, "We do not consider payments toward disabled veterans, pensions for the poorest disabled veterans, and GI benefits for soldiers returning from Afghanistan to be waste, fraud, and abuse."

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to this amendment and to the underlying Republican budget resolution and in support of the Spratt substitute that will be up shortly. The Federal budget is a statement of our Nation's priorities. It is where we put our national resources to meet our Nation's most important needs. Unfortunately, this budget has fundamental flaws and has misplaced priorities that I think shortchange the American people. Instead of investing in a strong, more prosperous America for years to come, the Republican budget neglects our economy, explodes the national debt, undermines key investments in homeland security, education, health care, and continues to spend Social Security trust funds. All of these priorities are sacrificed for another large tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. I guess it means we take from the many to give to the few.

I am most disappointed in the Republicans cuts in education, however. Prior to my service in this body, I served as the superintendent of schools for my home State of North Carolina, and I sought this office because the Republican majority under Newt Gingrich targeted public education in America, and I said I was coming to this House to fight to stop it. We have made a great deal of progress on changing the dialogue on this critical issue, but unfortunately the rhetoric is a lot more pro-education than the record.

Last Congress the President of the United States signed into law the No Child Left Behind Act, which promised to start new investments to improve schools in this country; but before teachers, students and parents get a chance to figure out the tough requirements that we passed, and, yes, I voted for that legislation, under this new law the administration has failed to fund its own program; and the fact is that this budget underfunds it with the consent of the administration, totality so far by about \$20 billion to No Child Left Behind. I cannot and I will not agree to these outrageous cuts in education.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget's \$400 million cut eliminates after-school initiatives in my home county for children, about 11,000 of them. It cuts teacher quality programs for every State in this country. For the State of North Carolina, \$1.7 million. For the great universities and colleges we have in this country that are training our future leaders, it will cut Pell grants in these programs to make a difference; Cutting the Perkins loans money that makes a difference, having children who transfer from community college to university. This budget cuts \$765 million for COPS, et cetera, et cetera.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, probably the worst example of misplaced priorities

in this budget is the shameful treatment of our children of our fighting men and women. As we all know, right now Americans, men and women, are now putting up a proud fight on the other side of the world, and yet in this budget we are cutting Impact Aid to schools in this very budget that they have proposed. That is wrong. The Observer in my home county said a 14.5 percent cut will eliminate \$173 million that helps pay for books and classrooms for these children, and that is absolutely wrong. We can do better.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes for the purposes of entering into a brief colloquy with the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year of 2004. First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for his willingness to work in partnership with me to ensure that this budget resolution lays the groundwork for a successful reauthorization of highway and transit programs. I am pleased that this resolution includes a contingency procedure for surface transportation, which will provide the flexibility we need to reauthorize our highway and transit programs. Under this contingency procedure, spending from the Highway Trust Fund for highway and transit programs will be increased above baseline levels to the extent that Highway Trust Fund receipts are increased. For every dollar increase in Highway Trust Fund receipts, a dollar increase in budget authority for highway and transit programs will be permitted. This contingency procedure is a necessary first step in our efforts to meet the infrastructure investment needs of our Nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems.

I have three concerns with the resolution I hope can be worked out in conference. First, the baseline level assumed in the resolution for the trust fund share of transit programs is frozen at the fiscal year 2003-enacted level. The reason that has been given for this assumption is uncertainty over the solvency of the transit account of the Highway Trust Fund. I want to assure the chairman that my committee intends to restructure transit programs such that the solvency of the transit account will be ensured. This restructuring, which is also proposed in the President's budget, will allow the transit account of the Highway Trust Fund to support increased spending levels.

Second, I am concerned that the resolution allocates just \$3.378 billion each year for the airport improvement program. This is below the President's request and significantly below what

will be needed to meet our airport capital needs when we reauthorize aviation programs later this year.

Finally, I believe the reconciliation instructions for the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure are based on unrealistic assumptions. Most of the mandatory spending under my committee's jurisdiction results from Coast Guard and railroad industry retirement programs. I do not agree with the assumption in the resolution that these programs can be cut.

I hope to continue working cooperatively with the chairman on these concerns as the resolution goes to conference with the Senate. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Budget if he will continue to work with me to address these concerns.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I thank the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for his work in getting us to this point in time. Obviously there are a number of challenges. I will continue to work with him and members of his committee as we go to conference. We have a huge issue this year, as the gentleman knows. It is going to fall on his committee. We have challenges we need to meet in all of the transportation needs of our country. So, yes, I would be happy to work with the chairman as we move to conference on this issue, and I appreciate his support of our resolution.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, again I thank the chairman for his work and working with me and trying to work through these important issues. I do believe we need a budget, and he has a tremendous task in front of him. He has done all he could for my area of transportation, and I urge support for this resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining 9 minutes be yielded to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) as long as he does not give me another zinger here.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

□ 1915

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Toomey plan, which I find even worse, if possible, than the majority Republican plan. I have been doing this now for 7 years, and every year the sense of unreality grows greater as I see charts and graphs on the other side that bear, in my opinion, very little relation to reality. The charts and graphs this year, the budgets proposed, both of the Republican budgets, seem to me totally

unrealistic. The charts are misleading in an astonishing number of respects.

We are dealing with what can only be called voodoo economics. But we have to ask ourselves, among all the numbers, what is really going on here? Well, if you set aside all the numbers, and you look at all the different changes that are being made, two things are going on.

The Republican majority is determined, absolutely determined, to shift the burden of government from the Federal level to the State and local level. This is an effort to cut taxes at the Federal level and increase them at the State and local level. It is an effort to reduce the amount of money that the Federal Government provides States and municipalities for environmental issues, for health care, for education, in order to diminish the size of the Federal Government. That is it. That is what is going on. That is number one.

Number two, the second effort that is being made by the majority here is to make sure that the burden of taxation in this country is reduced from those at the upper income levels, so that it burdens those at middle income levels more than it has in the past. The way of doing this, of course, is to give little, bitty tax cuts to people in the middle of the income scale, and to give massive tax cuts to people at the upper end of the income scale. The reason for doing this, I would add, is the other side believes in a flat tax, but they do not want to argue a flat tax; they simply want to arrive there.

Look at a couple of the charts. We have heard over and over again how much ordinary citizens will benefit from eliminating the tax on dividends. Look at the chart. Here is the tax benefit. This is designed to show how people at different income groups will benefit.

Let us skip all of those who earn less than \$100,000, because even if they are just below \$100,000, households will only get about \$300 a year. If you earn between \$100,000 and \$200,000, you get \$885. If you earn between \$100,000 and \$200,000 a year, you get a total of \$885. But if you move up the scale to where you are earning around \$1 million, that is where the benefit comes. Then you get an average tax benefit, annually, of \$45,000. That is why everything the other side says about averages makes no sense.

Then they say we need to accelerate the tax cuts passed last year and make them permanent. The same deal. If you earn between, pick a different category, pick between \$200,000 and \$500,000 a year, you get \$2,000 a year. Below that it is not much. But if your household takes in about \$1 million a year, it is \$63,000 a year.

There is no moral justification for stripping this much money out of the Federal Government, cutting education, cutting veterans' benefits, in order to give tax cuts to the richest people in the country. It is an outrage.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the previous speaker, just to observe that under the budget that we are proposing, the Republican Study Committee, and under the President's tax plan, a family of four making \$35,000 a year would pay nothing in federal income taxes. Zero. In fact, the top 50 percent of wage earners in America pay 96 percent of all Federal income taxes. When you lower taxes, it is just hard not to lower the taxes on the people who are actually paying the taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman challenged that statement, because we are hearing a lot of rhetoric here that does not track.

I continually hear from my constituents that we need to rein in runaway Federal spending. Do you know what? They are right. More government spending does not necessarily make our economy better. When we are at war, and we are, this is the exact time when we should be reducing spending, cutting taxes and getting the economy back on track.

When a family sits down to manage their monthly budget, they have to prioritize what is best for them at that time in their lives, and they usually make a list of needs and wants. A need is not the same thing as a want. For a family, a need is a roof over their head or food on the table. A want could be dinner out at a restaurant or a movie. So you fund first things first. Then whatever is left over at the end lets you fund the wants. You cannot just spend, spend, spend and hope you have enough to cover the tab.

The same needs to be done with the Federal budget. During these difficult times, when we are at war, when we need to spur the economy, we must differentiate between the needs and wants. We cannot just spend, spend, spend.

Our first need is to protect our country, so that means we fully fund defense. While this budget does not devote a full 4 percent of gross domestic product to the national security as I would prefer, it does meet the President's request for homeland security funding.

I will tell you something: This Toomey budget funds defense higher than domestic spending for the first time in many years. I think, because of our situation, we need it. Our Constitution requires us to provide for a common defense. Let us not shirk that responsibility.

Another priority is to help the economy rebound. It is a proven fact that when people can keep more of their own money, the economy grows. That is why we lower taxes. When entrepreneurs have more money, they can

use that capital to hire more employees, buy more equipment or expand their business.

This economy could use a turnaround, and letting people keep more of their own money will help our economy grow.

Frankly, I am a bit disappointed in the Republican Study Committee budget because it does not do more to rein in Federal spending. However, I think most would agree, this is a good compromise for this time.

Look, this budget makes tough choices; but that is why we are elected, to make tough choices. The good people of my district sent me here because they wanted a smarter, more efficient government, and the Republican Study Committee budget is a step in the right direction; increasing defense, lowering taxes and reining in runaway government spending. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the budget that we have put forth by the Republican majority is almost an unbelievable exercise in fiscal irresponsibility. On the very first day of the war that we are now fighting, the majority party introduced a budget resolution that does not provide 1 cent, not 1 cent, to prosecute this war. This budget resolution contains more than \$1 trillion in tax cuts that would benefit very few Americans, while endangering Social Security and Medicare.

I offered an amendment to the budget resolution to express the sense of the Congress that no new tax cuts should be passed until the Health, Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds are secured, but I was, of course, denied the opportunity to offer the amendment here tonight.

When we take a look at what is before us, when so many things are uncertain, I believe we need to pause before we pass into law huge, permanent tax cuts paid for by shortchanging essential programs, such as Medicare, education, veterans and funding for first responders. Right now we do not even know how long the war may last or what it might cost. It is irresponsible to pass a budget without taking all information into account.

If you take a look just the part on the veterans, the majority party cuts \$14.2 billion over the next 10 years in benefits such as compensation for service-connected disabilities, burial benefits and GI education benefits. They are cut in this. What kind of message does that send to our troops fighting overseas? The fighting troops today are the veterans of tomorrow.

The Republican plan also fails to provide necessary homeland defense for State and local communities. It is just as important to provide homeland defense resources, training and staff for our local firefighters, EMTs, police of-

ficers and medical workers as it is to equip our troops overseas.

The Democratic substitute we will have a chance to vote on later tonight will provide \$34 billion in extra money, new money, over the next 10 years for homeland security. In fact, \$10 billion of this money would go to our States and local communities, right now this year.

I would urge a no vote on the budget resolution of the Republican Party as it is fiscally irresponsible. Vote no on the Toomey substitute, and support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from New Jersey, I yield myself such time as I may consume to observe that although our budget grows spending every year, total spending grows, it grows at a slower rate than the alternative budgets, and that is why we are able to get back to balance faster than any other budgets, and why I look forward to the Blue Dog support, and that is why the Americans for Tax Reform and Citizens Against Government Waste have endorsed the Republican Study Committee budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the proposed amendment offered by my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

As elected officials, we are sent here and are supposed to be responsible to the people that send us to office, but government spending has ballooned out of control, and it is the people back home in our districts who are the ones forced to foot the bill.

Over the last 7 years, discretionary spending has grown at an average rate of 3.5 times the rate of inflation. I do not know anyone back in my district who has seen their family budget go up at such rates time and time again. Spending is growing at a rate faster than the family budgets. It must stop.

Right now people back in our districts are turning on their TVs, they are seeing our men and women, our sons and daughters, our friends and neighbors in harm's way. We are engaged in a war on terrorism. We are still experiencing the aftermath of 9/11 as it affects our economy.

So we are asking our families to tighten their belts because of that. We are asking county governments, State governments to do more with less. Is it not the responsibility of us here in Washington to lead then by example, to do the same thing, maybe to even take one step further?

We can give a lot of examples, and you have heard some already, about the waste in government: Over \$8 billion in erroneous earned income tax payments; I think someone else mentioned around \$13.3 billion on Medicare; around \$1 billion under the veterans' programs.

Let me say, cutting wasteful spending is not enough. We in Congress must

take the next step and actually begin to make the tough decisions we were sent here for in the first place.

Every single program that we vote on has someone behind it that supports it and likes that program. But we are elected to Congress to make those tough choices, to do what is the first priority of us in Congress, to make sure that our folks back at home are safe, that this is a secure Nation, and that our men and women and troops overseas have the supplies, equipment and training necessary to get the job done.

We cannot do less than sending them a responsible budget. Our children, our neighbors and our troops, they are dependent on us.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the administration's budget cuts highway construction by \$2.5 billion below this year's budget and slashes funding necessary to keep Amtrak running. The official House Republican budget cuts the discretionary transportation programs by 22 percent below the 2003 budget enacted just a month ago. The proposal before us is even worse.

The administration claims to be committed to economic growth and jobs, but this administration has the worst job growth record since Herbert Hoover. In fact, the administration's record is job loss, not growth; nearly 2 million non-farm payroll jobs lost in 2 years. On average, that is 73,000 jobs lost for every one of the 26 months of this administration. Yet cuts in transportation spending loses even more jobs tacked onto that miserable Republican economic record.

The Republican Party is only concerned about tax cuts for the already wealthy. When the economy is doing well, cut taxes for the already wealthy. When the economy is in recession, cut taxes for the already wealthy. When we are at peace, cut taxes for the already wealthy. Now while we are at war, cut taxes for the already wealthy.

Their highest priority is tax cuts for the already wealthy. They are not paying for their war, not reducing their deficits and debt, not keeping their promises to leave no child behind, not providing health care for veterans and the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, the already wealthy do not need more tax cuts. Vote no on this Republican budget and support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support the balanced budget alternative offered by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

□ 1930

The Toomey budget offers several key priorities for the Nation at this time of war and economic uncertainty.

The people of Colorado sent me here to rein in out-of-control government spending, to cut taxes, and to get government off their backs. Instead of spending the people's money like there is no tomorrow, we ought to provide real leadership and real solutions to demonstrate responsible fiscal discipline.

Mr. Chairman, just as it is our duty to protect American families from cowardly acts of terrorism, it is also our duty to protect the well-being of American families by balancing the budget to grow the American economy. It is our duty to protect the people's wallets by allowing taxpayers to keep more of their hard-earned dollars. I do not want to mortgage the future of working families because we cannot say no to a government that is far too big and spends far too much. The American people will be proud of the Toomey budget because it keeps President Bush's tax cuts intact, while balancing the budget in a realistic 4-year time frame.

I ask my fellow Members of Congress to stand up and to do the right thing for America. Let us not shirk our responsibilities to future generations. Please join me in supporting the Toomey budget amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, both Republican budget resolutions, the leadership resolution and the Toomey alternative, give us high deficits, high interest rates, and increased trade deficits. They take capital out of the capital markets and make it unavailable for private business investment, thus resulting in slower economic growth.

Now, to sell anything that bad, one needs a commercial. This morning I brought such a commercial to the floor, but marketing experts tell us a commercial requires repetition. So here, once again, is a commercial on behalf of both Republican budget resolutions:

Allowing corporations to skip out on their American taxes just by renting a hotel room in the Bahamas: \$4 billion. Ending taxes on dividends: \$385 billion. Ending the estate tax, even for the largest estates: \$662 billion. Knowing you can pass the entire cost to future generations: Priceless.

RepubliCard: It is everything the super-wealthy want it to be.

Also available, the Deficit Express Card, now with a \$4.2 trillion credit limit. The Deficit Express Card: Don't leave the House without it.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the creative and very amusing account from my good friend who just spoke about this. However, I would remind him that if he is very concerned about the size of the deficit and the magnitude of the

debt, then he will vote for the RSC budget, the Toomey budget, because that is the one that gets us back to balance quickest; that is the one with the smallest deficits and the least debt.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we are at war, and I think most taxpayers understand you spend what it takes to win a war. We are in a recession as well, and taxpayers understand you spend what it takes to keep people in their jobs and to create new jobs for those who have lost them. But what taxpayers do not understand and will not accept is when we use it either to go on a spending spree that keeps us from balancing the budget, or keeps us from paying down our debt, or keeps us sending pork home to America and taking it out of their tax dollars.

This budget supports a strong national defense, promotes new jobs in a stronger economy, but it holds the line on spending. It says, let us tighten our belts in Washington; let us start to balance the budgets sooner than other budgets, and let us get people back to work.

This budget also includes a Federal sunset act, an encouragement for Congress to pass a bill to balance obsolete agencies, to eliminate duplication among our agencies, and to begin asking agencies to put up or shut up; to produce, to succeed, to support our taxpayers. What we are trying to do is conserve our dollars, identify wasteful spending within our agencies and within our programs so that we have enough dollars for a secure America, for health care, for education, and to send dollars back home.

Mr. Chairman, I support this budget. It makes a lot of sense, and perhaps because it makes sense is why it is getting so much resistance here in Washington.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield myself the remaining time.

I would just say in conclusion that if the Members of this House want to vote for a budget that gets us back in balance without balancing the budget on the backs of our children, our elderly, or our most worthy citizens, and our sick and disabled veterans; if they want to get back into balance by the year 2010, we present a budget, our own alternative, which takes us there steadily every year with a lower and lower deficit and accumulates \$931 billion less in new public debt than the Republican budget.

So I would say that those who are conservative, those who want to vote for a fiscally responsible and conservative fiscal policy will have that opportunity, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for the House democratic alternative as something that achieves my colleagues' objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the

gentleman from North Carolina by observing that the Democrat substitute has more spending, has higher taxes, and it has larger deficits for longer than the substitute that we are debating at this point.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, he is incorrect on all accounts, including the assignment to me to North Carolina. I am from South Carolina.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the gentleman from South Carolina. That was the one mistake I just made.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the alternative budget resolution proposed by the Republican Study Committee.

I think sometimes we get into the details of these budgets and take a look at it just on a year-to-year basis, but I think it might be helpful for us to step back just a little bit, to step back to a time when I was only 2 years old. What was the tax burden on the average family in the year 1950? In 1950, you have a mom and a dad and 2 kids, and dad would go out and earn a dollar bill. Out of that dollar bill, 3 pennies of it would go for direct State, Federal, and local taxes.

Now, about 4 years ago, what happened? Mom and dad and 2 kids. Dad goes out to earn a dollar. Now we go from 3 cents to 38 cents tax on that average American family. That average American family is paying more in taxes than they are for what they pay for food and clothing and shelter combined.

In one generation we have come a long way in the growth of big government, and at a time when State and local governments and families all across the country are tightening their belts, it is time for the Federal Government to do the same thing.

The Republican Study Committee budget freezes total discretionary spending for 1 year. That is not too unreasonable considering it grew 9 percent this last year.

One of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, my constituents sent me here was to take a look at the idea of reducing not only the size, but the scope of Federal Government, and that is the debate we should be having. It is important to get rid of wasteful spending, but it is even more important that we take a look at actually reducing the scope of some of the things that we are trying to do.

When we are talking more tax on a family than 38 percent, more than they pay for food, clothing, and shelter, we are not talking about a safety net anymore, we are talking about excessive government.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the Toomey amendment to the budget resolution. I congratulate our chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), on presenting a wonderful budget to this Congress. But indeed, there is even a better budget, and that is one that presents less government and more freedom.

Now, many people criticize this budget. They said there is not enough government spending involved in this budget. But, Mr. Chairman, over the last 5 years, we have increased VA, HUD and Independent Agencies 35.7 percent; Commerce and Justice 32.3 percent; Transportation, 79.7 percent; Education, 132 percent, and the list goes on.

How much government is enough? Does anything good happen in America that does not result from a government program? And if not, perhaps we should just double these budgets every year, or perhaps even triple them.

But let me tell my colleagues, since I have been on the face of the planet, the Federal budget has grown seven times faster than the family budget. If the family budget grew as fast as the government budget, right now that family budget would be at \$79,059, instead of \$51,407.

Mr. Chairman, if all of these government programs did us so much good, then perhaps we ought to look at increasing the funding for each and every one. But instead we know that HUD has spent \$2.6 billion in Section 8 overpayments out of \$31 billion. The National Park Service spends \$800,000 for an outhouse, and it does not even work. And the list goes on and on and on.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, particularly at a time of war, and when families, hard-working American families, are having to make tough economic decisions around their kitchen table, should they not at least expect their Congress to make smart decisions? I do not think anything less should be expected out of this body. We can indeed save money without cutting needed programs and without raising taxes on the American people.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the Nussle budget, but in stronger support of the RSC Toomey budget. Let me make it clear why.

This Congress, year in and year out, faces the challenge of setting a budget for our Nation, but it seems to me this year we are divorced from reality. The reality of this Nation is that in the last 7 years, nondefense discretionary spending has grown by a staggering 66 percent. Over the past 7 years, discretionary spending has grown at three and a half times the rate of inflation. In fiscal year 2003 alone, we increase spending by 9 percent over the previous year in 1 year only.

Enough is enough. The reality is that across America, local governments,

State governments, city governments, county governments are making real dollar cuts in their spending.

Now, to its credit, the Nussle budget says, we ought to scale back. It walls off certain areas, but it says we ought to at least have a 1 percent cut in some areas where we can achieve that. But the rest of the budget spends too much money.

Let us look at what we have been doing in spending. Since 1996, agricultural spending is up 27.5 percent; Commerce Department, 40.2; Energy, 34.4; HHS, a staggering 94 percent; and Education, 131.9 percent. I could go on and on.

Mr. Chairman, I was here in 1995 when we enacted real spending restraint in this Congress. We did not actually stop the growth of spending, but we sure slowed it down. What is lacking now is discipline.

I was a participant in those hearings when we went across America and we asked the American people, can you do with less government? And they looked us in the eye and they said, yes. They said, so long as the restraint in spending, the cuts which we are asking them to make, were evenly distributed across our society so that all programs took some hits, they were willing to do it.

We face a slowed economy, and we face a war. It is time for the Congress to exercise discipline. It is time for the Congress to lead. The Toomey budget does that. It says that these are not normal times. It says that we can, in fact, do with a little less.

I want to draw a parallel to American businesses. Every one of us here knows businesses back home, every one of us knows the key to business. What is the key to business in America? It is year after year doing more with less. What has made America's economy boom in the last few years leading up to the recent situation? I will tell my colleagues what made it boom. It was improvements in efficiency. It is doing more with less.

□ 1945

Yet that is a concept that we do not even think about in government. Is it impossible for us to do more with less in the government? I suggest it is not, and I strongly support the budget of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just make the following observation, Mr. Chairman. Most of us on both sides of the aisle talk a pretty good game about fiscal discipline. Here is the opportunity to walk the walk.

This substitute budget slows down the growth rate of government spending. It has more in tax cuts to get this economy growing again. It reaches a balance faster than any other budget that is considered today on the floor. It does so within 4 years. It is endorsed by Americans for Tax Reform and Citizens Against Government Waste.

For any of our colleagues who are serious about getting our deficit under control, I urge a "yes" vote on this substitute.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Republican Study Committee Budget Substitute. Former President Reagan said it best when he said, "government does nothing as well or as economically as the private sector." These are trying times and our Nation faces serious challenges in the coming months. With that in mind, it is irresponsible to fund projects that deter or deviate from the original intent of government. Instead, we must plan ahead and put forth our best effort to return to a balanced budget.

The RSC Budget includes all of President Bush's economic growth package, tax fairness proposals and balances the budget in 4 years. Four years. With the decreases in capital gains taxes, we will create over 1 million new jobs. There is no better time to return hard-earned money back to the American people. And I have no doubt that any effort to remain fiscally responsible will help boost economic growth.

In 1950, we were paying 2 percent of our money to the government. Today, that figure has skyrocketed to 30 percent. A 28 percent increase. In 2001, the Federal Government made \$20 billion in overpayments. Not to mention that it cannot account for another \$17.3 billion. Should not the American people be permitted to spend their money as they choose? How can we expect the people of this country to tighten their belt, when we cannot impose strict fiscal discipline on ourselves?

The RSC Budget includes a reserve fund for Social Security reform. Under the current system, nearly \$6 trillion would be needed just to repay the trust fund. According to the Social Security Administration, it will take only about \$7 trillion to fix the system permanently. Our baby boomers deserve a secure retirement. They paid for it.

This budget retains the President's defense spending numbers and the President's funding levels for homeland security—crucial now, when our courageous military heroes are depending on our support.

It is time to return to an era of economic prosperity. Time to put an end to reckless Federal spending. Men and women in our military are sacrificing their lives for our country. We have the power to do the same in Congress by making our own sacrifices to cut back on wasteful spending and balance the budget. There is no more appropriate time to do so than now. Having said that, I commend Mr. Toomey for introducing the best budget that he possibly could at this historic time in our Nation's history.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and in support of the CBC and Democratic Alternative budgets.

I didn't think a budget resolution could be much worse than the one produced by the Majority, but then I see the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. This amendment calls for more tax cuts and more cuts in nondefense and non-homeland security spending.

Like the parent resolution offered by the Majority leadership, the budget cuts called for in the gentleman's alternative are just unrealistic. In fact, the \$1.6 trillion tax cut proposed by the

gentleman's alternative, requires that domestic spending be cut by an additional \$8 billion.

The budgets proposed by Republican Study Conference and the Majority leadership will force authorizing committees' to reduce eligibility requirements and benefits for people programs that service our children, veterans, farmers, federal workers and more.

Like the parent resolution, the RSC amendment provides more tax cuts for the wealthy that are bound to continue to take our economy down the glide path of additional deficits. What I don't understand is why our distinguished majority rightly calls on all Americans to support the war effort in Iraq, but is not willing to pay for its costs. That is a major disconnect.

The Democratic and CBC alternative budgets offer targeted tax cuts that are designed to stimulate the economy and produce real jobs. Up to a million jobs will be produced by the Democratic Alternative in 2003. The Majority's plan, on the other hand, creates only 190,000 jobs in 2003.

The CBC and Democratic Alternative budgets provide more money for Medicare prescription drugs. The Democratic Alternative sets aside \$528 billion in new money for a prescription drug program. We deliver and the President's party doesn't.

The Democratic Alternative and Black Caucus budgets invest in education and training. These increases will enable Congress to increase funding for the "No Child Left Behind Act."

The Democratic and CBC Alternatives protect our men and women in war; they advance the security needs of our homeland; they increase our investment in human capital and the nation's infrastructure. And they do so in a fiscally responsible way.

Soon we will be asked to redevelop and rebuild Iraq. We will be asked to pass appropriations that will develop and modernize that country's health care delivery system, repair and build 3,000 miles of major thoroughfares; upgrade the country's maritime ports, build classrooms and provide student supplies; provide 20,000 units of housing; rebuild the country's financial system; establish a potable water delivery system; and more.

It is ironic that this administration and the majority party in this Chamber will be asking us to spend billions to invest in redeveloping the infrastructure in Iraq while it simultaneously cuts back our investment in American cities, states and individual human capital. The Members on the other side of the aisle may be able to explain that to their constituents, but I know I won't be able to explain it to mine.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the gentleman's amendment and support the CBC and Democratic Alternatives budget resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 80, noes 342, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

AYES—80

Aderholt	Doolittle	Otter
Akin	Dreier	Paul
Bachus	Duncan	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Dunn	Pitts
Bartlett (MD)	Feeney	Pombo
Barton (TX)	Flake	Radanovich
Beauprez	Franks (AZ)	Rehberg
Bishop (UT)	Garrett (NJ)	Rohrabacher
Blackburn	Goode	Ryan (WI)
Blunt	Goodlatte	Ryun (KS)
Boehner	Green (WI)	Schrock
Brady (TX)	Hayworth	Sensenbrenner
Burgess	Hensarling	Sessions
Burton (IN)	Herger	Shadegg
Cannon	Hoekstra	Sherwood
Cantor	Istook	Shimkus
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Stearns
Chabot	Keller	Sullivan
Cole	King (IA)	Tancred
Cox	Kingston	Taylor (NC)
Crane	Linder	Terry
Cubin	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Culberson	Miller (FL)	Tiberi
Deal (GA)	Miller, Gary	Toomey
DeLay	Musgrave	Weller
DeMint	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Norwood	

NOES—342

Abercrombie	Davis (IL)	Holt
Ackerman	Davis (TN)	Honda
Alexander	Davis, Jo Ann	Hooley (OR)
Allen	Davis, Tom	Hostettler
Andrews	DeFazio	Houghton
Baca	DeGette	Hoyer
Baird	DeLahunt	Hulshof
Baker	DeLauro	Hunter
Baldwin	Deutsch	Inslee
Ballance	Diaz-Balart, L.	Isakson
Ballenger	Dicks	Israel
Bass	Dingell	Issa
Becerra	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Bell	Dooley (CA)	Jackson-Lee
Bereuter	Doyle	(TX)
Berkley	Edwards	Janklow
Berman	Ehlers	Jefferson
Berry	Emanuel	Jenkins
Biggert	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Bilirakis	Engel	Johnson (IL)
Bishop (GA)	English	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (NY)	Eshoo	Jones (NC)
Blumenauer	Etheridge	Jones (OH)
Boehert	Evans	Kanjorski
Bonilla	Everett	Kaptur
Bonner	Farr	Kelly
Bono	Fattah	Kennedy (MN)
Boozman	Ferguson	Kildee
Boswell	Filner	Kilpatrick
Boucher	Fletcher	Kind
Boyd	Foley	Kirk
Bradley (NH)	Forbes	Kleczka
Brady (PA)	Ford	Kline
Brown (OH)	Fossella	Knollenberg
Brown (SC)	Frank (MA)	Kolbe
Brown, Corrine	Frelinghuysen	Kucinich
Brown-Waite,	Frost	LaHood
Ginny	Gallegly	Lampson
Burns	Gerlach	Langevin
Burr	Gibbons	Lantos
Calvert	Gilchrest	Larsen (WA)
Camp	Gillmor	Larson (CT)
Capito	Gingrey	Latham
Capps	Gonzalez	LaTourette
Capuano	Gordon	Leach
Cardin	Goss	Lee
Cardoza	Granger	Levin
Carson (IN)	Graves	Lewis (CA)
Carson (OK)	Green (TX)	Lewis (GA)
Case	Greenwood	Lewis (KY)
Castle	Grijalva	LoBiondo
Chocola	Gutierrez	Lofgren
Clay	Gutknecht	Lowey
Clyburn	Hall	Lucas (KY)
Coble	Harman	Lucas (OK)
Collins	Harris	Lynch
Conyers	Hart	Majette
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	Maloney
Costello	Hastings (WA)	Markey
Cramer	Hayes	Marshall
Crenshaw	Hefley	Matheson
Crowley	Hill	Matsui
Cummings	Hinchee	McCarthy (MO)
Cunningham	Hinojosa	McCarthy (NY)
Davis (AL)	Hobson	McCollum
Davis (CA)	Hoeffel	McCotter
Davis (FL)	Holden	McCrery

McDermott	Pickering	Smith (TX)
McGovern	Platts	Smith (WA)
McHugh	Pomeroy	Snyder
McInnis	Porter	Solis
McIntyre	Portman	Souder
McKeon	Price (NC)	Spratt
McNulty	Pryce (OH)	Stark
Meehan	Putnam	Stenholm
Meek (FL)	Quinn	Strickland
Meeks (NY)	Rahall	Stupak
Menendez	Ramstad	Sweeney
Mica	Rangel	Tanner
Michaud	Regula	Tauscher
Millender-	Renzi	Tauzin
McDonald	Reyes	Taylor (MS)
Miller (MI)	Reynolds	Thomas
Miller (NC)	Rodriguez	Thompson (CA)
Miller, George	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (MS)
Mollohan	Rogers (KY)	Tierney
Moore	Rogers (MI)	Towns
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner (OH)
Moran (VA)	Ross	Turner (TX)
Murphy	Rothman	Udall (NM)
Murtha	Roybal-Allard	Upton
Nadler	Royce	Van Hollen
Napolitano	Ruppersberger	Velazquez
Neal (MA)	Rush	Visclosky
Nethercutt	Ryan (OH)	Walden (OR)
Ney	Sabo	Walsh
Northup	Sanchez, Linda	Wamp
Nunes	T.	Waters
Nussle	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson
Oberstar	Sanders	Watt
Obey	Sandlin	Waxman
Olver	Saxton	Weiner
Ortiz	Schakowsky	Weldon (FL)
Osborne	Schiff	Weldon (PA)
Ose	Scott (GA)	Wexler
Owens	Scott (VA)	Whitfield
Oxley	Serrano	Wicker
Pallone	Shaw	Wilson (NM)
Pascrell	Shays	Wolf
Pastor	Sherman	Woolsey
Payne	Shuster	Wu
Pearce	Simmons	Wynn
Pelosi	Simpson	Young (AK)
Peterson (MN)	Skelton	Young (FL)
Peterson (PA)	Slaughter	
Petri	Smith (NJ)	

NOT VOTING—12

Buyer	John	Smith (MI)
Combest	Kennedy (RI)	Thornberry
Gephardt	King (NY)	Udall (CO)
Hyde	Lipinski	Vitter

□ 2015

Messrs. GUTKNECHT, CONYERS, BRADLEY of New Hampshire, BONNER, SABO and Mrs. NORTHUP changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. MANZULLO changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 79 I was receiving a briefing on the war in Iraq with Secretary Rumsfeld and General Meyers. That occurred simultaneously with this rollcall.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Stated against:

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, during Rollcall Vote 79, I was detained at a briefing from Secretary Rumsfeld on the war with Iraq. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 108-44.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 3 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. CUMMINGS:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,510,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,684,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,831,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,958,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,075,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,197,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,327,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,511,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,707,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,863,500,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$44,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$67,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$91,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$105,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$112,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$119,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$134,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$84,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$57,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$59,300,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,836,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,958,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$2,064,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,165,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,264,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,370,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,483,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,546,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,588,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,699,400,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,883,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$2,002,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$2,100,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,198,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,298,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,404,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,517,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,589,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,620,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,735,800,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: —\$372,800,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: —\$317,500,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: —\$269,100,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: —\$239,800,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: —\$223,700,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$2,197,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$2,327,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: \$2,511,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$2,707,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,863,500,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$4,013,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$4,013,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2004 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$387,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$392,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$396,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$395,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$406,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$396,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$416,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$399,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$427,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$414,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$441,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$429,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$453,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$444,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$464,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$460,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$476,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$465,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$488,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$482,639,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,946,950,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$35,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,605,889,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,081,480,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,277,406,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,803,109,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,962,954,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,539,171,000.
(B) Outlays, \$35,662,213,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$38,289,854,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,289,854,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,289,854,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,946,950,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$35,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,605,889,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,081,480,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,277,406,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,803,109,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,962,954,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,539,171,000.
(B) Outlays, \$35,662,213,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$38,289,854,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,289,854,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,289,854,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,524,057,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,055,651,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,274,538,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,836,764,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,040,029,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,606,499,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,794,370,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,418,638,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,590,256,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,705,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,410,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,189,500,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,970,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,721,500,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,540,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,263,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,160,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,852,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,780,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,441,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,430,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,058,500,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,695,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,780,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,371,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,460,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,987,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,118,500,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,962,575,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,273,600,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,109,920,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,181,200,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,022,140,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,984,300,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,835,085,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,583,800,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,404,610,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,600,300,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,420,285,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,722,400,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,536,280,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,836,800,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,644,960,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,963,300,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,765,135,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,096,400,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,891,580,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,440,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,811,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,383,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,735,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,355,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,688,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,355,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,666,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,386,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,678,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,448,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,719,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,541,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,790,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,668,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,595,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,827,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,030,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,022,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,202,000,000.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,212,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,808,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,616,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,204,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,028,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,608,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,448,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,020,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,876,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,439,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,313,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,867,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,759,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,304,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,214,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,750,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,678,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,205,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,151,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,634,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,678,650,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,514,500,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,821,300,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,664,900,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,977,700,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,818,100,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,137,300,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,974,600,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,139,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,466,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,296,700,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,635,300,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,462,600,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,808,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,631,800,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,984,200,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,804,500,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,163,900,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,480,600,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$99,839,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,363,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,202,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$80,760,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,815,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,393,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,429,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,316,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,057,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,950,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,746,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,307,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,503,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,938,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,340,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$74,694,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,208,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,544,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,112,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$78,431,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,723,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,429,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,017,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,717,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,317,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,011,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,311,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,935,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,616,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,254,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,929,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,579,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,247,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,911,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,573,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,249,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,904,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,594,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,242,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$107,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$104,860,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$117,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$115,346,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$129,470,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$126,881,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$142,417,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$139,569,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,658,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$153,325,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$172,223,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$160,775,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$189,445,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$185,657,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$208,389,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$204,222,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$229,227,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$224,643,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$252,149,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$247,107,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$242,955,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$238,096,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$247,814,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$242,858,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$252,770,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$257,825,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$257,825,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$252,669,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$262,981,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$257,722,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$268,240,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$262,876,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$273,604,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$268,132,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$279,076,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$273,495,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$284,657,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$278,964,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$290,350,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$284,543,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$250,955,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$250,955,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$265,608,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$260,608,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$292,411,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$292,411,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$313,160,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$313,160,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$336,365,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$336,365,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$351,278,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$351,278,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$377,120,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$377,120,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$403,968,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$403,968,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$403,507,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$403,507,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$460,889,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$460,889,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$367,050,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$359,709,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$374,391,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$366,903,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$381,879,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$374,241,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$389,517,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$381,727,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$397,307,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$389,361,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$405,253,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$397,148,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$413,358,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$405,091,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$421,625,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$413,192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

- (A) New budget authority, \$430,058,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$421,457,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$438,659,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$429,886,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$501,146,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$498,679,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$521,499,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$518,672,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$546,735,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$543,640,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$575,008,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$571,621,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$606,071,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$602,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$641,105,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$636,939,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$679,322,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$674,852,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$720,505,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$715,645,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

- (A) New budget authority, \$766,154,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$760,812,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$816,195,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$810,363,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$64,916,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$63,618,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$66,863,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$65,526,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$68,869,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$67,492,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$70,935,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$69,516,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$73,063,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$71,575,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$75,255,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$73,750,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$77,513,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$75,963,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$79,838,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$78,241,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

- (A) New budget authority, \$82,234,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$80,589,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$84,701,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$83,007,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$40,787,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$39,971,260,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$40,957,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$40,137,860,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$41,212,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$40,387,760,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$41,552,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$40,720,960,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$41,977,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$41,137,460,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$46,429,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$45,500,420,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$47,871,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$46,913,500,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$49,367,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$48,379,660,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

- (A) New budget authority, \$50,894,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$49,876,120,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$52,477,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$51,427,460,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,768,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,586,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,025,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,213,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,654,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,713,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,955,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,716,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,766,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,552,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,168,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,761,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,572,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,127,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$21,294,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,826,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,039,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$21,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,829,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$22,323,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$255,938,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$255,938,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$307,866,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$307,866,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$345,708,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$345,708,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$372,992,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$372,992,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$400,172,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$400,172,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$425,477,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$425,477,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$452,793,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$452,793,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$478,544,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$478,544,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

- (A) New budget authority, \$504,010,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$504,010,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$529,542,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$529,542,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2012:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2012:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than June 1, 2003, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive changes.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the level of direct spending for that committee by \$1,043,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and \$6,118,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(2) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the total level of revenues by not more than: \$16,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$1,677,500,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$6,712,500,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from

New York (Mr. OWENS) who was the architect of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus resolution.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to first congratulate the leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus for the agreement to produce this joint budget.

Our troops are in the field now, and we are going to support those troops. The best way we can support our troops is to try to bring them home by policy changes, not in body bags, but bring them home smiling on their feet. We also would like to support their families. This is a budget which we call "Leave No Families Behind."

Mr. Chairman, 35 percent of the members of the Army are African American. Two-thirds of the fighting force in Iraq, on the borders of Iraq, are members of working families. We want to take care of the families of the people who fight for America, and that is the gist of this budget. It is a budget for working families.

We have stayed within the requirements of the majority. Our current budget is \$1.836 trillion. We have begun by adopting the Rangel shared sacrifice freeze on tax cuts, and this generated a revenue base of \$1.5 trillion. This has allowed the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus to offer our current budget of \$1.8 trillion. Our budget projections reached a low deficit of \$72.9 billion in the year 2011, and we offer a surplus of \$87.7 billion in the years 2012 and \$127.7 billion in 2013.

It is the strong and overriding belief of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus that the budget and appropriations processes are the highest importance to our constituencies who make up the great majority of Americans. Budget priorities speak in a language of numbers and dollars that tell the people we represent how important their concerns and their welfare are to us. This budget was prepared against the backdrop of a recession at a time when the gap between the rich and the poor is greater in the United States than in any other Nation.

A recent report of the Federal Reserve states that the median net worth of white families went up 17 percent to \$120,900, while the median net worth for minority families during the same 3-year period went down 4.5 percent to \$17,000. The difference between \$17,000 and \$120,000 is a stark difference. Working families of all ethnic groups are included in this great gap between rich and poor, the white working families as well as minority working families.

A key component of this budget is a stimulus package which addresses the needs of all working families with proposals for extended unemployment and health care benefits immediately, and also for creating jobs as rapidly as possible. This budget also continues to focus on certain unique needs of Afri-

can American and minority communities.

Mr. Chairman, I thank all Members and staff, especially Jacqueline Ellis of my staff, who worked so diligently on producing this alternative budget.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the CBC/CPC substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this substitute because our reading is it raises taxes and increases spending, does not provide enough for defense, and fails to reach balance sooner. Having said that, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) wanted me to say that he knows the amount of time and effort that was put into this budget and also knows that there are important issues that will be brought out in this debate that this Chamber needs to hear.

So with that, I will just compliment my colleagues on working on this budget, say it is not a budget that we can support, but we look forward to listening to the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the chairman of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to participate with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the CBC in the drafting of this CBC/Progressive Caucus budget; and I am honored to be here with my co-chair, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for the fine work that he did in this regard.

I rise in support of the CBC/Progressive Caucus budget. This is the only budget that funds universal single-payer health care. This is the only budget that fully stimulates the economy with a \$300 billion economic stimulus package. This is the only budget that fully funds education. This is the only budget that fully funds transportation. This is the only budget that fully funds housing, and the only budget that fully funds veterans programs, and the only budget that fully funds the HIV-AIDS international support programs.

The CBC/Progressive Caucus budget calls on Congress to implement H.R. 676, Medicare For All. This legislation is a single-payer, universal health care plan which will guarantee access to health care, guarantee a universal high standard of care, and lower health care costs.

Earlier this month, it was reported that 75 million Americans went without health insurance in 2001 or 2002. Our failing economy and rising health

care costs are failing working families who make up the majority of the uninsured Americans. While costs continue to go up, we are not getting what we are paying for. Government expenditures account for 60 percent of total health care costs. Our government spends more money per person than countries that provide universal health care. Our citizens are so close to paying for a universal health care system, but so far from getting it.

Medicare For All would first improve the Medicare program by adding coverage for all medically necessary health services, including prescription drugs. During a transition period, Medicare would subsume other health programs like Medicaid and, finally, all Americans in nongovernment programs.

It has been estimated that Medicare For All could be paid for with the same amount of money that is currently in the system. Under Medicare For All, employers would maintain a contribution to employee health care in the form of a phased-in payroll tax. This payroll tax would be less than what employers now pay on the average. And unlike current skyrocketing health care costs, this contribution would remain stable. Medicare For All would help employers by eliminating the costs associated with providing private health care coverage, including annual negotiations, annual premium increases, and administrative tasks.

Patients would benefit because co-payments, premiums, deductibles and out-of-pocket payments would be eliminated for medically necessary services. Under this plan, patients would receive a card that would guarantee two things they do not now have: access to the health care they need and a universal, best standard of medical care. This would help to eliminate disparities in health care between whites and minorities.

It is time for Congress to stop trimming around the edges of the health care system. Workers, retirees, and employers are suffering together from the burdens of illnesses and increasing costs. Congress must budget for a real solution, that is, Medicare For All that is in this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for this opportunity to participate.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget resolution and in support of the joint Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus budget alternative. This alternative budget, entitled the Leave No Family Behind Budget Act, focuses national attention on spending on priorities that benefit all Americans.

It does this by funding key domestic priorities which address the needs of middle-income and working families, while fully supporting the national defense and protection of our homeland.

These priorities include education, health care, housing, child care, transportation, worker safety and protection, and business development. It would immediately repeal tax cuts for the upper-income brackets and would implement tax cuts for all families earning less than \$50,000 per year.

The CBC and the Progressive Caucus budget proposal involves several balanced components. It provides Medicare For All, it provides a \$300 billion economic stimulus package which includes an extension of unemployment insurance, and implements state revenue sharing; and it yields a balanced budget by 2008, at least 4 years earlier than the Republican budget.

This fiscally responsible budget freezes the 2001 tax cut in order to generate greater revenue.

□ 2030

As such, our budget provides \$528 billion for a Medicare prescription drug benefit and restores the deep cuts in education by increasing funding by \$20 billion over the Republican budget proposal. This means more funding for after-school programs, Head Start, Pell grants, child care programs, TRIO, Gear Up and the Leave No Child Behind Act. This means a prescription drug benefit that our seniors so desperately need.

Mr. Chairman, our budget alternative is feasible, balanced and fiscally responsible. It will get our country on the road to recovery while funding meaningful national priorities for our children, for our seniors, for our veterans and for our communities. It reflects the guiding principle that as a Nation we must come together and share the sacrifice that is required to strengthen our economy and put us on a better fiscal footing.

Unfortunately, the Republican budget is devoid of any recognition of this required sacrifice, because it provides \$1.4 trillion in tax cuts to the top 1 percent of American taxpayers. I say sacrifice this tax cut, restore funding for crucial domestic programs, and get our country back on the road to economic recovery. I have to admit that I am astonished that at a time when our economy is struggling, the Republicans continue to pursue tax breaks for the affluent at any cost. Their plan is both astounding and irresponsible. The Republican budget resolution would only prolong our country's economic downturn at a time when we need the greatest investment in our infrastructure and in our people.

Mr. Chairman, in these difficult and troubling times, we have a tremendous responsibility as a Congress to protect and provide for the needs of all Americans. But I and many of my colleagues believe that the Republican budget plan callously throws that responsibility aside. The Republican-proposed \$1.4 trillion tax cut is a reckless measure to pursue at this time, especially as we face war in Iraq and a continued war on terror to defend our homeland and our hometowns.

The Republicans and the President claim that tax cuts will serve to stimulate our economy, but the evidence does not support this assertion. The trickle-down tax cuts of 20 years ago did not revitalize our economy, and similar tax cuts today will not fare better. In fact, the CBO estimates that the Republican budget will add \$1.7 trillion in deficits over the next 10 years after completely depleting the surplus of the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds.

The Republican budget balances itself on the backs of Americans who can least afford it. It cuts Medicare by \$214 billion over the next 10 years, Medicaid by \$95 billion, veterans programs by \$15 billion, while giving a meager prescription drug benefit of \$28 billion to our deserving seniors. These cuts are unthinkable, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject such recklessness.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus for his leadership; also my colleagues the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH); and also to my staff, Julie, and all of our staffs who really worked many long hours to craft this very fair and balanced budget.

I rise in strong support of this budget, which really does provide a dramatic alternative to the Republican budget. As a member of the Congressional Black Caucus' executive committee, and also as cochair of the Progressive Caucus, I am doubly pleased to be a cosponsor of this joint alternative budget, which, in my opinion, represents the best alternative on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, we are united today in our opposition to the irresponsible, unfair and warped priorities as expressed in the Republican budget. We cannot and we will not support a budget that spends more on defective technology than on school construction, safe drinking water, vocational education and the fight against HIV and AIDS combined. We cannot and will not support a budget that eliminates vital support for programs such as HOPE VI, the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program and brownfields redevelopment. We cannot and will not support a budget which slashes after-school programs, the school lunch program, veterans' benefits, housing programs, school loan programs, and ignores our Nation's vital need for a meaningful economic stimulus, including relief to the unemployed. Above all, we cannot and we will not support a budget that puts lavish and massive tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans above everything else, thereby mortgaging our children's future.

What we can and what we will support, however, is this reasonable and fair alternative. Our budget provides a real, fast-acting economic stimulus

which includes \$180 billion for payroll tax relief, \$50 billion for Federal revenue-sharing with States, and \$50 billion for infrastructure investment. Our budget provides health care for every single American, a benefit that no other budget offers.

Our budget also goes well beyond the Republicans' rhetorical commitment to education by providing serious resources. It fully funds the Leave No Child Behind Act, invests in substantial school construction, our Nation's teachers, vocational education and student loan programs. It also provides critical resources to our Nation's community development and housing programs. It creates a national housing trust fund, restores the administration's cuts to eliminate the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program, and it provides over \$1 billion for economic and community development.

In addition to funding critical programs at home, our bill also commits substantial increases in funding toward fighting the HIV/AIDS pandemic abroad and commits \$1.2 billion over the President's reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan.

How can our budget really afford to fund these priorities? It is really very simple. Instead of tax handouts to the wealthy, our budget freezes the tax cuts passed in 2001, closes corporate tax loopholes, and really does ignore President Bush's new tax cut proposals. In short, our budget has its priorities straight.

I encourage our colleagues to join me in supporting our budget. Let us support our troops tonight, Mr. Chairman, by passing this budget that says in no uncertain terms that we intend to bring you home to a country that places your economic security as our highest priority. I thank the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for this alternative and for their hard work.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¼ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the GOP budget sends the message loud and clear: Weapons and tax cuts are more important than people. That is bad public policy. I know it, my constituents in Marin and Sonoma Counties in California know it, and most of the people in the United States agree. It is time to look at the entire picture and put together a budget that provides support to all American families, including the men and women in our military. That is why I rise today in support of the Progressive/Black Caucus budget. Our budget includes support that American families need and support that American families deserve.

Our budget includes affordable health care, because by providing universal

access for a high standard of health care, no parent will have to worry about taking their child to a doctor when that child is ill. Our budget recognizes that real support includes educational opportunities for every kid. It is not enough to pay lip service to the importance of education. Instead, this budget makes a firm commitment to provide \$20 billion more for school construction, for teachers, for student loans and vocational education programs. No family, military or otherwise, will ever feel supported if their children are not receiving a top-notch education.

Speaking of the military, our budget recognizes that real support includes comprehensive care for members of our military when they return home as veterans. This budget recognizes that it is not enough to provide servicemen and women with bombs and missiles while they serve and then ignore the sacrifices they have made to protect our country when they return home. That is why the Progressive/Black Caucus budget provides over \$3 billion more for funding of veterans programs than President Bush. We do not just support our troops with bombs and missiles, we support them along with all American families with access to quality health care and quality schools.

I urge my colleagues to join us in providing true support for our families by voting for the Owens-Cummings-Kucinich-Lee substitute.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cummings-Owens-Kucinich-Lee substitute. The Republican budget contains no specific Medicare or Medicaid cuts, but the fact is it mandates a 1 percent cut in all mandatory spending, which translates to approximately 10-year cuts in Medicare and Medicaid of \$215 billion and \$93 billion respectively. For Illinois, this means 10-year Medicare cuts of approximately \$10 billion and Medicaid cuts of more than \$3 billion for the same period. Estimated cuts for my district alone are at least \$1.4 billion; cuts in public housing, cuts in education, cuts in veterans' health care, cuts in Justice Department programs.

With the Republican budget, I am afraid that all of the bloodshed we shall see will not be in Iraq. All I am hearing about this budget is cut, cut, cut. I am afraid that when all you do is cut, cut, cut, all that you are going to get is blood, blood, blood. The blood of the American people will be on the hands of those who held the knife.

There are more than 2 million people in jails and prisons throughout the United States. More than 600,000 of them are being released each year. This poses a real threat and a real problem to many communities, especially low-income areas where they come from and return. The Justice Department reports that the cost of crime to victims

is \$450 billion annually. The proposed Republican House budget cuts Justice programs \$4.1 billion below the amount needed to keep up with inflation and \$881 million below the President's proposed budget. The Cummings-Owens-Kucinich-Lee budget restores the funding level back up to \$3.4 billion for Justice programs and to expand reentry programs for nonviolent ex-offenders to help these individuals transition back into normal life, to get housing or jobs, social service help, to be reconciled with their families and communities, and to cut down on the recidivism rate, which is almost 50 percent.

This is a good budget, a responsible budget, and a problem-solving budget. I am pleased to support the Cummings-Owens-Lee-Kucinich amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, while we obviously have some disagreements with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle on the budgets and what our budget does, I understand my colleague has a number of speakers. We obviously do not have a number. I would be happy to transfer 10 minutes of our time to be controlled by the gentleman so he has an additional 10 minutes to control.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) will control 10 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding that time to us.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have left with our 10 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Counting the additional 10 minutes, the gentleman has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, in his speech to the Nation on Monday, the President said, "War has no certainty but the certainty of sacrifice." Many in our country are sacrificing. That list begins with the hundreds of thousands of brave young men and women who as we speak are putting their very lives on the line in Iraq out of a sense of duty to their country. But there is one small group of Americans who are not only not being asked to sacrifice, but get huge new benefits in the Republican budget. That would be the millionaires, the richest of the rich, who get most of the \$1.4 trillion tax cut in this Republican budget. Warren Buffett, who opposes tax cuts, would get \$300 million just from elimination of the stock dividend taxes.

Sacrifice, it seems, is only for the little people. The children sacrifice. Head Start is cut. Health insurance, college loans, school lunch programs are cut. Veterans are asked to sacrifice, again. Veterans disability, education and health care benefits, cut. Seniors, cuts in Medicaid for nursing home care, and forget a meaningful prescription drug benefit under Medicare. Not enough money in the Republican budget.

□ 2045

Homeland Security, for crying out loud, a pathetic .8 percent increase, even more when we are at orange alert and even though only when 2 percent of containers are inspected at ports.

The country is hurting from a struggling economy and war, but this Republican budget shamefully pours salt in the wound. A vote for the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus budget is a vote for America's working families.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget is simply unfair and unrealistic. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have sacrificed prudence for politics. Long-term planning for short-term gain. How else can we explain \$1.3 trillion in tax cuts, most of which are given to the most privileged at a time when our schools are crumbling, our veterans are being deprived of the healthcare that they need, and a \$348 billion deficit.

The Republicans have proposed cutting \$51 billion for the State Children's Health Insurance Program, depriving 5.3 million children of health insurance; cutting \$2 billion for the Ryan White programs, depriving people living with AIDS, medical care, and social support they need; cutting \$1.5 billion for community health centers, eliminating health care for millions of low-income and uninsured people; eliminating the section 8 program that provides housing for over 300 million low-income families. Even the President's No Child Left Behind education bill, which he constantly touts as a major success, is cut by 8 percent below the inactive level of funding year 2003. Homeland Security is not properly funded. As a matter of fact, it is severely underfunded, putting our police officers, firefighters, and all of our first responders in danger. Where is the compassion that the President promised during his campaign?

I support the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus alternative budget because it truly provides relief to Americans and it provides a stimulus to help the economy get back on its feet. Our budget provides healthcare for all Americans. It provides for vital infrastructure improvements throughout the Nation which provide jobs and protect America from potential terrorist threats. It provides \$3.5 billion in relief to those inflicted with HIV/AIDS throughout the world, and importantly it provides our men and women in uniform the resources they need. It is indeed a balanced budget that does not burden our children with debt. We must resist this Republican budget, and I am going to urge my colleagues to support this alternative.

In conclusion, the Republican budget is an unjust and shameful budget. If Congress enacts this budget, many Americans will be harmed.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, my constituents have been paying attention to what has been going on with this preemptive strike; and when they heard about the billions of dollars offered to Turkey and other countries in exchange for their support, they said to me, Ms. WATERS, I thought we were broke. I thought we were in deficit. I thought we had no money. Where are you getting the billions of dollars from for Turkey and other countries that you are offering to them simply if they will support this preemptive strike?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Throughout the time that I have been a Member of Congress, it is always the Congressional Black Caucus that has come forward with a budget that has priorities in it that describe the aspirations that I have for this Nation: the aspirations for quality health care, for education, for economic opportunity, foreclosing of the gap between the richest and the poor, between black and white. It is the Congressional Black Caucus budget that has always been the aspirational budget and again this evening, Mr. Chairman. It is the Congressional Black Caucus budget which among all of the budgets is the best budget that has been to the floor.

In a multitrillion dollar budget, there is always going to be some parts, various things in anybody's budget that everybody can agree to. But this is the best budget that we will debate this evening. It is the most honest budget that we will debate this evening because we say point blank to the American people what my constituents are saying to me over and over again: How in the world can we be cutting taxes? How can we be cutting taxes and spending from deficit spending? How can we be cutting taxes for the richest people in America when we are going to war? And my constituents ask me that all the time. I do not have any answer for them, and some of us are honest enough to say to our constituents we think this is a bad tax cut policy. It makes no sense to turn around and cut taxes and then have a Republican budget that essentially has all of our discretionary spending in every year that we are 10 years out being funded with deficit spending. That is outrageous. That is outrageous.

So this budget is honest. It sets the aspiration for universal healthcare and coverage for all American citizens. It does not play games with it; and I submit that if we pass just the health care part of this budget, there would be so substantial a savings in our health care industry that we would see the benefit of it just from healthier people, from people getting preventative health care rather than rushing to emergency rooms and getting their health care in

the most expensive and least efficient manner. That is what we have forced our people to do in this country. We aspire to a better America. That is what this budget does, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank the gentleman from Connecticut who has so graciously yielded time for us to express ourselves in this august Chamber, as well as the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and of course the gentleman from Baltimore, Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Owens), the architect that put it all together.

When Governor Bush was running for President, one would think that he picked up a Democratic National Committee Campaign piece of literature. He was for education, Leave No Child Behind, prescription drugs; and when he was appointed to office by the United States Supreme Court and he got there, he had a substantial surplus in the budget, the Social Security trust fund and the Medicare trust fund. It looked like it was on its way to full recovery. But the programs that he had promised, instead of getting that, what we did get was a \$1.3 trillion tax cut, most all of which went to the wealthiest Americans in our country. As a result, as we stand here today, the surplus is gone. We have no prescription drugs. We expect devastating cuts in the Republican budget. And one thing that we did not know was that we would be in war. Of course we do not like talking about that because Republicans say if one talks about money and how much the war cost that one is preempting the President from declaring the war; but now that the bombs are dropping, I assume somewhere before this debate is over, somebody would be slipping some papers to us saying what the estimated cost of the war is.

Our budget says that this is the patriotic budget. This is the antiterrorist budget. This is a budget that protects our young people on the field by saying the President did not know, I do not think he knew, that he was going onto declare war before his budget, before his 1.5 trillion tax cuts. So, therefore, what we are saying from a tax policy is let us freeze everything. Let us just put a stop to the tax cuts, a stop to the flooding of our deficit, and just take a look at what America should be all about and adopt this budget as one that is the budget of patriotism, a

budget that tells the terrorists that we believe that as the President is concerned with liberating and bringing democracy to Iraq, as the President has a concern about bringing democracy to the region, as the President has a concern to capture the oil fields, increase the production, and get the revenue to improve the education and health care of the people in Iraq, that the antiterrorist patriotic budget says that we have the same commitment and a stronger commitment to the people in the United States of America to provide the health care, the affordable housing, the education to make us more productive so that we can protect this democracy.

We want to give our men and women that are fighting in the Middle East all the protection that they have today; and when they come home, we will be there to say that we fought against cutting their budgets for veterans benefits, for health benefits, and for education benefits. Vote for the patriotic budget. That is the one that is on the floor now.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican 2004 budget with its \$1.3 trillion tax cuts and heavy burdens on States and territories and of course in strong support for the CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget. The Owens-Cummings-Kucinich-Lee CBC/Progressive Caucus substitute advances the principles of family, hard work, inclusiveness, and national solidarity by calling for increased Federal assistance for education, health care, housing, child care, and business development. It represents the values and moral principles that have made America great.

As Chair of the Health Braintrust of the CBC, I am particularly pleased that this budget reverses many of the cuts in the President's budget which are seen as an attack on programs which would address the health needs of minorities and women. Our budget also calls for the implementation of a single-payer universal health care plan which will guarantee high-standard health care at a lower cost to every person living in the United States, its territories, and commonwealths.

My colleagues, the issue of health disparities for minorities continues to be worse. Last year the Institute of Medicine released a landmark report entitled "Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care," which documented key findings in areas of health care where minorities receive less than adequate care and recommended various policy changes. These recommendations are reflected in the CBC/Progressive Caucus budget, and they include

increasing the budget of the Office of Minority Health, the budget of the National Center for Minority Health and Health Disparities research at the National Institutes of Health, increasing the budget of the Office of Civil Rights to reverse the low-priority status that this important office has in addressing racial and ethnic disparities in health care. It also provides increases for the health professions, including the Health Careers Opportunity program and provides scholarships and loan repayments in order to address the startling underrepresentation of people of color in the health professions.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity to begin to address a number of important problems facing the majority of our constituents, while at the same time providing the resources needed to support our troops and defend our homeland.

□ 2100

Let us not give tax cuts to those who do not need them. Let us invest in the American people, as this CBC Progressive Caucus budget does.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and support the Owens-Cummings-Kucinich-Lee alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican fiscal year 2004 budget resolution and in strong support of the CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget. At a time when our country is facing serious threats of terrorism, as well as waging war on Iraq, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are ignoring current economic problems by continuing to incorporate \$1.3 trillion in additional tax cuts while continuing to place additional burdens on the cash-strapped states.

The Owens/Cummings/Kucinich/Lee CBC/Progressive Caucus Substitute advances the principles of family, hard work, inclusiveness and national solidarity by calling for increased federal assistance for education, health-care, housing, childcare and business development. The CBC/CPC Alternative Budget represents the values and moral principles that have made America great.

As the Chair of the CBC Health Braintrust, I am particularly pleased that the CBC/CPC reverses many of the cuts in the President's budget which were seen as an attack on programs to address the health needs of minorities and women. Our budget also calls for the implementation of a single-payer universal health care plan, which will guarantee high standard health care at a lower cost to every person living in the United States, its territories and Commonwealths.

My colleagues, the issue of health disparities for minorities continues to be worse than ever. Minorities are a quarter of our population, but make-up two-thirds of all new AIDS cases. African American infant mortality is twice that of whites. Diabetes afflicts Hispanics twice as often as whites. And African American men suffer prostate cancer at a rate twice that of white men.

Last year, the Institute of Medicine, IOM, released a landmark report entitled: Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care which documented key findings areas in health care where minorities

receive less than adequate care and recommended various policy changes to eliminate these unacceptable disparities.

These recommendations included specific funding increases, which the CBC/CPC budget proposes. They include increasing the budget of the Office of Minority Health; the budget of the National Center for Minority Health and Health Disparities at the National Institute of Health and increasing the budget of the Office of Civil Rights at the Departments of HHS to reverse the low-priority status that this important office in addressing racial and ethnic disparities in health care. We also provide increases for funding for Initiatives for Health Professions including the Health Careers Opportunity program, and to provide scholarship and loan repayment relief in order to address the startling under representation of ethnic and minority groups in the health professions.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity to begin to address a number of the major problems facing the majority of our constituents while at the same time provide the resources needed to support our troops and defend our homeland. We can only do this however if we do not follow the wrong lead of our majority colleagues and cut taxes for people who don't need it at a time when we must increase spending.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and support the Owens/Cummings/Kucinich/Lee alternative budget.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget resolution tonight, and I strongly endorse the Congressional Black Caucus-Progressive Caucus budget resolution and our Democratic alternative.

Immediately after the Republicans passed their budget out of committee, one of the first groups that I heard from to object to their proposal was the American Legion. Representing America's honorable veterans, the American Legion stated that, "The budget defies common sense. There must be a better way to provide tax relief to the American people than to balance the budget on the backs of disabled veterans."

Disabled American Veterans call the House Committee on the Budget budget "indefensible and callous." They represent nearly 1.3 million disabled veterans in the country, and they believe the Republican budget asks veterans to "swallow a bitter pill to remedy an illness of their own making."

Republicans are calling for a \$15 billion cut in veteran benefits over the next 10 years. Over \$800 million will be cut in health care programs for veterans next year alone. These budget cuts will impact a very large population in my own district.

I would like to just let the Members know in my own district we have over 28,000 veterans from all former wars that are still alive that reside in my district. Many are minority veterans. Mr. Chairman, 1.4 million of those veterans live in the Los Angeles County area; 2.3 million of those veterans live in the State of California.

We must keep in mind that among our troops being sent abroad right now are many young men and women representing our State of California. I know that, because I had an opportunity to meet with many of them in my district. I met three of them, three young women, two Asian women and one Latino. One was a student enrolled in college, telling me that her dream was to come back and become a teacher. The other two were in their profession. They almost had tears in their eyes, telling me that they had actually joined up to be in the Reserve unit, not knowing they would now be faced with something that was unimaginable. I pray for them, and I pray for their families.

Mr. Chairman, I know that what we are doing here tonight is very exemplary, by supporting the Black Caucus budget, the Progressive Caucus and the Democratic alternative, because we care about families, we care about the very people that are spending their time this evening defending our Nation.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me time.

First of all, let me thank the proponents of this budget. As the world watches, as the Nation watches, I believe most Americans as they pray for the troops are wondering whether or not we are caring for them and their needs.

I thank the distinguished chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, but I also thank the proponents and writers and authors of this legislation, particularly the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and any number of individuals, and, as I said, the gentleman from Maryland (Chairman CUMMINGS).

This is a budget that addresses the pain of America. It realizes that it is extremely unrealistic, Mr. Chairman, with the war looming, the needs of home-front security, to give, as the Republican budget wants to do, \$726 billion in tax cuts to 1 percent of America. One percent of the rich of America will be getting the big chunk of the Republican budget.

What a tragedy that as our firefighters are laid off, police persons are not being paid and EMS services are

cut back, we cannot find the good reason to have a bipartisan budget.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget and the Progressive Caucus budget deals with the pain of America. It provides additional funds for job training and family services. It ensures that education is prioritized, and it really does support No Child Left Behind.

In addition, when we talk about defense, we have unique initiatives; a defense school readiness initiative, which provides for communications equipment and training to public schools; a strategic language and culture initiative that funds higher education initiatives for the study of key languages.

Then we deal with unemployment insurance for the thousands of individuals laid off. We give them an extension in unemployment. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you, we are going to be laying off Americans.

Then with respect to health care, we believe in funding Medicaid so that the least of those who cannot get into our various health facilities will be able to do so. And we support our veterans. We do not throw them out in the street because they do not have the money.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that America is looking to this Congress tonight to be receptive to their pain and their need. Who will stand with us and vote for this legislation? I ask my colleagues to vote for this budget and vote against the Republican budget.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for yielding me time, and especially for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus and Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, which I am proud to support.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a moment to say that there are a lot of people suffering in our Nation tonight.

The Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus believe very strongly that we must have a very balanced approach to addressing our budget concerns. On the one hand, we must be clear to protect ourselves against terrorism, and we must be clear with regard to supporting our troops. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, we must be clear in taking care of the people who have worked so hard to make this Nation the Nation that it is.

We must work hard, Mr. Chairman, and this is what the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus budget does, to help folks like Mr. Shapiro in Baltimore, who said he had been

working for years on a prescription drug program, but give me something that is meaningful, because I am about to die. But maybe you can do this for my fellow people in my housing project. Or perhaps it is for the little girl in the eighth grade at West Baltimore Middle School in my district, who still is reading from a textbook where Jimmy Carter is still President. Or it might be the students who are in the honors class at another school in my district, who have no microscopes on their desks, but they are supposed to go on and become great biologists. Then the question becomes, are we taking care of all of our people?

I have often said that we have to protect ourselves from the outside, but we have to be very careful that we do not implode from the inside.

So the fact is that the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus have presented a budget tonight which is one that takes care of our health needs. It is one that truly leaves no family behind. It is one that makes sure that the young people at Morgan State University in Baltimore, where we have to let go 1,000 students every year because they do not have the money, it makes sure that they have the Pell grants that they need.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the House to support the Black Caucus-Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding part of his time to us. We really appreciate it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that we appreciate the work that went into the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus substitute. We understand that they, more than most Members in this House of Representatives, know that there are people suffering tonight. So we do not dispute that fact.

But we believe that the best way to help people who are suffering is first to protect America at home and abroad with a strong national defense and a strong Department of Homeland Security, to strengthen the economy, and create jobs, and to be fiscally responsible. We really believe that is the best way to help people who are suffering.

Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague and I would both agree that we would like to have a budget that is balanced today. We might come to a different conclusion as to why we have gotten to this point. The economy has slowed; I believe that September 11, a day that I will remember in infamy, had something to do with it; and we believe that the best way to get us out of this kind of lull in our economy is to provide an economic engine, which we believe are tax cuts.

So we are providing an increase in defense spending, homeland security, Social Security, Medicare and veterans. We are asking for a 1 percent reduction, a penny on the dollar, this

year, in discretionary and mandatory programs. We think this 1 cent on the dollar for 1 year is something that we can do as mature and responsible Members of the Congress. Lord knows our political colleagues in the statehouses and in local communities are having to make much more difficult decisions.

I would conclude by saying that when I hear references of who is getting the taxes, we acknowledge this: That the people who pay taxes get the tax cuts. That is true. Five percent of the American people pay 50 percent of the taxes, and 50 percent of the American people pay 96.5 percent of the taxes, and they get the tax cut. But we also know when they get this tax cut, they use it to invest in America and create jobs for all Americans.

I know we have another budget to consider, so I will conclude my remarks. I appreciate the dialogue that has taken place on the floor tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to not support this budget substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 85, noes 340, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

AYES—85

Ackerman	Hinchey	Olver
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Owens
Ballance	Honda	Payne
Becerra	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Berman	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Bishop (GA)	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Rush
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.	Sabo
Capuano	Jones (OH)	Sanchez, Linda
Carson (IN)	Kilpatrick	T.
Clay	Kucinich	Sanders
Clyburn	Lee	Schakowsky
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Scott (GA)
Crowley	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Majette	Serrano
Davis (AL)	Maloney	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Markey	Solis
DeFazio	McDermott	Stark
Delahunt	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Engel	McNulty	Tierney
Eshoo	Meehan	Velázquez
Evans	Meek (FL)	Waters
Farr	Meeks (NY)	Watson
Fattah	Millender-	Watt
Filner	McDonald	Waxman
Ford	Miller, George	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Woolsey
Grijalva	Napolitano	Wynn
Gutierrez	Neal (MA)	
Hastings (FL)	Oberstar	

NOES—340

Abercrombie	Baca	Bartlett (MD)
Aderholt	Bachus	Barton (TX)
Akin	Baird	Bass
Alexander	Baker	Beauprez
Allen	Ballenger	Bell
Andrews	Barrett (SC)	Bereuter

Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Billirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor

Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kantor
Kapoor
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)

Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancred
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas

Thompson (CA)
Tiahrt
Tiberti
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen

Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler

Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Buyer
Dooley (CA)
Gephardt

Hyde
Lipinski
Mollohan

Thornberry
Towns
Udall (CO)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain on this vote.

□ 2132

Ms. McCOLLUM and Messrs. UDALL of New Mexico, HEFLEY, CANNON, KANJORSKI, PALLONE, and SAXTON changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Ms. MAJETTE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 108-44, as modified by the special order of today.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 4 in the nature of a substitute, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 4 in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by Mr. SPRATT:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,272,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,482,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,612,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,753,572,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,871,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,988,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,106,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,234,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,454,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,638,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,779,210,000,000.

(B)(i) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced for the following fiscal years are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$87,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$4,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$11,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$25,000,000,000.

(ii) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased for the following fiscal years are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: \$15,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$12,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$17,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$25,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$27,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$40,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$27,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,831,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,867,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,977,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$2,105,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,222,302,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,336,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,442,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,550,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,681,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,770,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,869,957,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,818,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,858,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,963,008,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$2,071,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,184,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,300,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,413,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,525,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,663,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,737,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,873,559,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$545,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$375,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$350,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$317,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$313,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$312,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$306,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$291,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$209,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$99,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$94,349,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$6,783,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$7,238,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$7,695,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$8,140,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$8,582,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$9,027,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$9,468,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$9,898,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$10,250,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$10,498,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$10,743,438,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$3,954,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$4,153,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$4,317,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$4,435,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$4,526,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$4,594,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$4,638,044,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$4,646,359,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: \$4,553,659,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$4,335,482,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013: \$4,097,406,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$392,494,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$386,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$400,546,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$400,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$420,071,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$414,237,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$440,185,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$426,011,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$460,435,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$438,656,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$480,886,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$462,861,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$490,817,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$478,499,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$500,590,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$491,801,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$511,603,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$507,486,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$522,781,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$511,780,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$534,323,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$528,178,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,506,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,873,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,808,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,822,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,349,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,799,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,591,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,557,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,719,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,329,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,818,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,150,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,743,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,001,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,590,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,845,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,408,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,699,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,274,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,153,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,556,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,525,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,848,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,330,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,618,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,112,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,316,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,949,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,097,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,722,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,833,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,350,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,528,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,006,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,183,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,687,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,847,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,372,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,520,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,062,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,198,000,000.

(4) Energy (270)

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,074,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$439,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,587,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$929,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,710,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$962,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,613,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,245,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,432,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,023,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,988,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,402,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,977,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,663,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,085,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,784,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,182,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,957,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,289,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,319,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,402,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,295,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,816,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,940,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,894,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,212,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,589,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,403,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,567,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,991,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,393,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,735,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,272,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,424,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,690,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,735,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,838,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,845,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,958,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,980,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,945,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,003,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$41,032,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,418,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,365,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,212,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,272,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,047,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,129,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,934,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,681,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,521,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,911,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,772,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,510,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,534,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,979,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,136,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,441,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,617,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,038,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,230,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,777,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,695,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,812,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,881,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,513,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,588,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,795,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,062,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,795,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,580,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,687,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,365,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,798,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,575,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,013,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,723,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,065,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$70,053,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,731,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,238,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,328,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,512,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$74,025,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$73,783,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,812,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$75,585,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$77,692,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,386,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$79,690,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$79,265,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,732,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,251,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,994,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,935,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,205,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,128,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,479,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,429,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,754,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,759,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,674,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,152,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,256,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,519,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,565,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,906,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,914,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,306,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,705,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,676,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,110,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,079,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,699,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,455,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$89,231,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$86,741,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,187,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,153,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,372,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$91,751,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,186,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$93,333,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$96,078,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$95,182,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$98,047,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$97,090,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,149,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$99,155,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,497,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$101,344,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$104,761,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$103,610,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$107,105,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$105,956,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$231,653,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$227,796,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$238,353,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$236,574,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$253,424,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$253,184,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$271,423,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$270,524,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$292,423,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$290,938,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$314,333,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$312,907,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$337,338,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$335,970,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$363,412,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$360,992,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$391,476,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$389,861,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$422,084,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$420,023,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$455,673,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$453,522,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$248,586,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$248,434,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$261,750,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$262,022,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$276,023,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$278,953,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$319,263,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$316,006,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$351,571,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$351,822,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$379,712,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$379,565,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$409,822,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$409,553,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$441,465,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$442,719,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$484,282,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$487,635,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$522,221,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$518,390,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$565,545,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$565,794,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$322,074,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$329,797,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$322,458,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$324,488,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$332,172,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$333,684,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$340,968,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$342,304,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$349,004,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$350,185,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$362,022,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$362,757,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$373,427,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$374,367,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$386,204,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$387,392,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$403,672,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$404,893,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$395,443,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$396,952,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$410,730,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$412,578,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,255,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,255,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,345,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,282,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,467,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,431,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,591,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,568,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,117,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,099,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,011,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,994,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,213,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,197,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,511,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,494,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,395,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,376,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,615,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,596,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,679,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,660,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,597,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,486,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,665,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,684,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,860,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,814,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,606,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,709,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,288,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,810,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,612,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,492,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,236,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,282,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,975,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,034,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,712,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,059,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,550,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,960,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$78,515,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,543,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$41,193,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$40,631,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$39,934,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$40,424,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$40,192,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$40,133,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$40,927,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$40,510,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$42,140,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$41,668,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,421,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$42,905,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$44,752,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$44,211,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$46,131,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$45,577,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

- (A) New budget authority, \$47,556,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$46,971,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$48,987,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$48,414,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$18,178,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,103,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,255,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,820,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,643,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,677,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,410,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,381,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,842,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,533,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,920,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$21,619,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$21,138,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,361,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$21,835,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$23,110,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$22,560,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

- (A) New budget authority, \$23,905,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,489,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$24,714,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,121,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$240,447,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$240,447,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$257,374,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$257,374,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$300,930,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$300,930,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$335,137,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$335,137,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$357,478,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$357,478,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$377,426,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$377,426,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$396,894,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$396,894,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$414,220,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$414,220,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$430,321,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$430,321,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

- (A) New budget authority, \$442,545,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$442,545,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$449,801,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$449,801,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$39,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$39,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,519,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,519,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,174,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,174,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,329,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,329,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,634,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,634,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

- (A) New budget authority, \$2,440,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$2,440,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$2,796,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$2,796,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$41,104,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$41,104,000,000.

- (A) New budget authority, —\$42,894,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$42,894,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$52,598,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$52,598,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$54,459,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$54,459,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$51,535,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$51,535,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$53,540,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$53,540,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$52,609,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$52,609,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$54,685,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$54,685,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$56,841,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$56,841,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$59,025,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$59,025,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$61,229,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$61,229,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT.—In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or both committees report a bill, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report thereon is submitted, which provides a prescription drug benefit

under the medicare program that is voluntary, equitable, comprehensive, affordable, dependable, protects beneficiary access to drugs, and is cost effective, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall revise allocations and adjust aggregates in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, subject to section 203.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) The term “equitable” means that all medicare beneficiaries shall receive comprehensive prescription drug coverage and that coverage shall be accessible to all beneficiaries regardless of where they live.

(2) The term “comprehensive, affordable, and dependable” means that all beneficiaries shall have access to a drug benefit that contains a defined benefit and premium and coverage at all levels of drug spending, is administered through a stable and dependable delivery system so that beneficiaries will not lose coverage or face significant premium increases from one year to the next, and provides additional assistance with premiums and cost sharing to low-income beneficiaries.

(3) The term “protects beneficiary access to drugs” means that the benefit shall include coverage for all medically necessary drugs and shall preserve access to local pharmacies.

(4) The term “cost effective” means that the benefit shall include measures that lower the cost of prescription drugs and not include measures that would encourage employers to drop existing retiree coverage.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR THE UNINSURED.

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or both committees report a bill, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report thereon is submitted, that would provide affordable, comprehensive health insurance coverage to the uninsured and builds upon and strengthens public and private coverage, including preventing the erosion of existing coverage under medicaid, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall revise allocations and adjust aggregates and in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, subject to section 203.

SEC. 203. TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS TO ALLOW FOR MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT AND HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.

The total of adjustments allowed under sections 201 and 202 shall not increase the cumulative deficit or decrease the cumulative surplus (whether by changes in revenues or direct spending) by more than \$131,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and \$528,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013, excluding interest.

SEC. 204. CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—In the House, if the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

- (1) for fiscal year 2004: \$39,233,000,000,
- (2) for fiscal year 2005: \$39,998,000,000,
- (3) for fiscal year 2006: \$40,841,000,000,
- (4) for fiscal year 2007: \$41,684,000,000, or
- (5) for fiscal year 2008: \$42,605,000,000,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate budget aggregates and increase the allocation of new

budget authority to such committee for fiscal year 2004 and for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 to the extent such excess is offset by a reduction in mandatory outlays from the Highway Trust Fund or an increase in receipts appropriated to such fund for the applicable fiscal year caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation.

(b) **ADJUSTMENT FOR OUTLAYS.**—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that changes obligation limitations such that the total limitations are in excess of \$38,594,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such fiscal year for the committee reporting such measure by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a).

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING FUNDING FOR HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the President's budget includes a total of \$41.3 billion for all homeland security activities for 2004, including mandatory, discretionary, and fee-funded activities;

(2) the President's current budget does not contain any additional funding for 2003 for homeland security beyond what has already been provided; and

(3) there is need for additional homeland security resources for 2003, 2004, and subsequent years in order to protect our country against terrorist attacks.

(b) **SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) this resolution provides \$10 billion in additional homeland security funding for 2003, and a total of \$24 billion in additional homeland security funding in the years 2004–13, for a total of \$34 billion above the President's request over the time period covered by this resolution; and

(2) this funding provides the resources needed to train and equip our first responders, strengthen the security of the Nation's transportation system and other critical infrastructure, increase the preparedness of our public health system, and secure our borders.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING THE CONSERVATION SPENDING CATEGORY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the fiscal year 2001 Interior Appropriations Act (P.L. 106–291), which established a separate discretionary spending category for land conservation and natural resource protection programs for the fiscal years 2001 through 2006, passed by large margins in both the House and the Senate;

(2) in establishing a separate conservation spending category, Congress recognized the chronic underfunding of programs that protect and enhance public lands, wildlife habitats, urban parks, historic and cultural landmarks, and coastal ecosystems; and

(3) the expiration of the provisions of law defining and enforcing the conservation spending category was not due to a lack of Congressional support for the programs included in the category or a loss of desire to set aside dedicated funds for those programs.

(b) **SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that any law establishing new caps on discretionary spending should include a separate conservation spending category for fiscal years 2004, 2005, and 2006 and that total funding for that category for each of those fiscal years should be set at the levels established in P.L. 106–291.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING CONTINGENCY AND PRIORITY RESERVE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that this budget resolution provides a total of \$54 billion of unallocated funds that have been counted as though spent, including the consequent cost of debt service.

(b) **SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the \$54 billion reserve in this resolution should be considered to provide funding for any contingencies and priorities that may arise.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, we have had two responsible alternatives offered. Mr. Chairman, this substitute should pass, and it should pass with an overwhelming number of votes from both sides of the aisle. Why? Because it is the fiscally responsible alternative that remains on this floor.

The Republican budget is an appalling betrayal of America's values and fails to meet our Nation's priorities. We really have to wonder, how does this Republican Party define compassion? By taking hot lunches out of the mouths of poor schoolchildren? By forcing the elderly out of nursing homes as the result of Medicaid cuts? By skimping on a prescription drug benefit for seniors? By slashing veterans health care on the very day, on the very day that our brave Armed Forces have begun the battle to disarm Saddam Hussein?

It is clear that the President's irresponsible \$1.4 trillion tax plan and the GOP's blind allegiance to it would be an albatross around the necks of the American people, as well as future generations.

To pay for it, the House GOP proposes to cut funding for Medicaid, student loans, scientific research, food stamps, education, and veterans benefits. Too often, those of us privileged to serve here speak in terms of billions or trillions. Well, tonight, Mr. Chairman, let us put a human face on these proposed budget cuts.

More than 90 students at the Eva Turner Elementary School in Waldorf, Maryland, who receive hot meals under the lunch program could have those meals eliminated.

Ervin Coleman of Prince George's County, who recently was forced to rely on Medicaid to cover the cost of his medical care, may not have that option under the Republican budget.

Rubin Hairston of Calvert County receives \$654 a month in Social Security

benefits, but his prescription drug cost is \$519. He simply cannot afford all his medication. The meager funding set aside for a drug benefit in this budget offers him little hope of relief.

I ask Members, is that a budget that reflects America's values? Is that a budget that meets America's priorities? Mr. Chairman, the American people want and deserve better. That is precisely what this Democratic budget alternative gives them.

First and foremost, our budget includes our entire stimulus plan, which would jumpstart the economy, provide tax relief, and create 1 million new jobs. Our budget provides more funding for homeland security, \$34 billion for safety here at home; more funding for education; and more funding for the environment, veterans, and other priorities. We also provide at least 35 percent more for prescription drugs.

Finally, our budget matches the President's defense request, protects Social Security, and achieves balance by 2010. Democrats urge all Americans to examine our budget and ask themselves which budget reflects America's values and meets our needs. The answer is clear.

The Republican budget is nothing more than a cynical, calculated political document designed solely to provide huge tax cuts to the most affluent. It will continue the deficit spiral and pass the debt along to the brave young men and women who are now in harm's way. That is not moral, it is not fiscally responsible, and it is pitiful policy.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Democratic budget for America and for generations to come.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) claim time in opposition?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, this substitute. We have come forward with a budget that provides significant increases in defense, homeland security, Social Security, Medicare, veterans benefits. We ask for a 1 percent cut in discretionary spending for 1 year, one cent on the dollar. When our States and local communities are having to make 5 and 10 percent cuts to their budget, we are asking 1 percent; and then we allow our budget to go up each and every year after that.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, the tax cut in the Republican proposal for 2004 is a tax cut of \$1.4 trillion, which is very close to the cost of the war effort. I find that not only to be interesting, but something that we need to take a look at very, very closely.

I think, when all is said and done on all of these different budget proposals, the one thing I think is absolutely sure is we have reverse socialism. What we are doing here is redistributing the wealth of this country to the top. JOHN MCCAIN was right-on when he said that 3½ weeks ago.

We have been accused on this side of the aisle year after year of trying to manipulate the budget, to manufacture the budget, so the money is going to be shifted down to those people who are making less than \$50,000 a year. This is not the case over the next 10 years. We have a redistributing of the dollar upward. That is a fact of life. Yet what we have done at the same time, not because one side of the aisle thinks more of the veterans of this country than the other, but in order to fit it into their budget, what they had to do is nickel and dime the veterans, who have already put their lives on the line. Yet we send young men and women to war. What guarantee are we going to give them when they come back that their benefits are going to be intact?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who, I would just point out, without embarrassing my colleague, is an American hero, and someone who can speak very clearly about what our men and women are going through.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I did not know if I was going to vote for this budget, but after the partisan rancor that I just heard on this floor, I am going to vote for it. It is despicable.

Talk about hurting veterans, talk about cutting Social Security. In 1993 when they had the White House, the House, and the Senate, what did they do? They spoke and talked about tax breaks for the middle class, tax breaks for the middle class. What did they do? They had the highest tax in the history of this Nation. They cut the COLAs of veterans. They cut the COLAs of our active duty military.

□ 2145

Where you said you were going to decrease the tax for the middle class, you increased the tax for the middle class. You took and utilized every dime out of the Social Security Trust Fund, and you had the gall, you have the gall to stand up here and accuse us of only for the rich.

Not a single Clinton budget after you controlled the White House, the House and the Senate ever passed this body or the other body. We brought up those budgets so that the Democrats would have to vote on them. They were so bad, and you know how many Democrats voted for it? Three. That is a fact because I will tell the gentleman, I thought we were going to have a debate, not a finger-pointing thing here tonight, and I had not planned even on speaking until I heard the speakers speak before me, and I had questions about our budget, but not after the rancor that I have heard on this floor.

You did in 1993 raise taxes. You did cut veterans' COLAs. You cut military COLAs. You raised the tax on the middle class, and now you stand here and say, oh, we want to balance a budget, and that we are responsible for the surplus, but not a single one of your policies ever passed when you had the leadership.

It is sickening to listen to this debate. The gentleman that is speaking here, normally I would and I would say even tonight his language has been honorary, and the different budgets that he has presented has been honorary, and I appreciate that, but for those that will sit up here and point fingers and say how mean the Republicans are because they want to cut veterans' COLAs or they want to hurt things is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to say that in 1993 we passed a budget. We took the deficit then in the budget, \$290 billion, down every year for the next 7 years until it reached a surplus in the year 2000 of \$236 billion, an exact polar opposite of what is happening right now.

Nobody in this House stands in greater admiration of the gentleman from California's (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) record in the military than I do and my personal like for the man, but I think we have to acknowledge that these fellow veterans, four different groups, have all come out in unmitigated condemnation of this budget because of what it does to veterans' benefits, and nobody shows greater indignation than the Paralyzed Veterans of America who wrote the Speaker saying, we do not consider payments to war-disabled veterans, pensions for the poorest disabled veterans and GI benefits for soldiers returning from Afghanistan to be waste, fraud and abuse.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from California may not like what Democrats are saying about the Republican budget, so let us listen to what others are saying about that budget.

Unconscionable, that is what four veterans organizations called the Republican budget. Callous, that is how the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans and Veterans of Foreign Wars describe the Republican budget. Perhaps Edward Heath, Sr., the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, said it best when he said this: "Mr. Speaker, this budget dishonors the service of millions of service-connected disabled veterans, including combat-disabled veterans. Is there no honor left in the hallowed halls of our government?" Well said, Commander Heath.

In just a few minutes we are going to be voting to support our troops. I must say, Mr. Chairman, to my Republican colleagues, what an odd way to support our troops when we are also going to be

voting tonight, at least they are going to be voting, to cut veterans' benefits and services by \$28 billion.

I would say that our veterans and our troops would appreciate it more if we supported them with our deeds, not our words, and that is why I am going to support the Spratt substitute, because the American Legion said it is a better approach. Not only does it not cut veterans' benefits, it keeps our commitments to veterans. It invests in our children's future rather than borrowing from it.

The Spratt budget, the Democratic budget, creates jobs, not deficits, for as far as the eye can see. We should vote for the Spratt budget. We should listen to the voice of the veteran leaders of America and say no to the callous budget of the Republican Party.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Democratic budget and oppose the Republican budget.

When Bill Clinton left office, we had record surpluses of \$200 billion, and in two short years, we have a deficit of \$300 billion, deficits as far as the eye can see.

Yes, there was a downturn in the economy. Yes, 9/11 caused part of it, but a large part of it were those tax cuts. What are the Republicans giving us now? More tax cuts for the wealthy as far as the eye can see.

Never in American history has there been a proposal for tax cuts at the time of war. This is so fiscally irresponsible that I just cannot believe it. We are leaving a legacy of debt to our children and our grandchildren, and the Republicans want to give us deeper and deeper and deeper debt and dig us deeper into a hole.

There is no economic growth in the Republican budget. There is no real drug plan in the Republican budget. The Democratic budget has \$128 million more for prescription drugs, \$34 billion more for homeland security. The Republican budget gives us cuts to veterans and schools and Medicaid and to our senior citizens.

The Democratic budget is responsible. The Republican budget subordinates all other priorities to additional lavish tax cuts. Vote for the Democratic budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished ranking member for yielding me the time.

We have talked a lot about what is in the budget. I would like to talk about two things that are not in the budget. The first particularly should be of interest to people who live in Washington State, my home State, Tennessee, Texas, Nevada, Wisconsin, Florida or South Dakota.

Residents of those seven States are unjustly treated in the Tax Code, and

this budget does nothing to correct it. Those States rely on sales tax to fund their State governments, but they are not allowed to deduct their sales tax from their Federal tax return as one is allowed to deduct their State income tax.

What that does is it disadvantages our State. The Federal Government essentially tells our States how we should tax our citizens. I believe it is an issue of State rights.

The Democratic Party introduced an amendment to the budget bill to fix this. Regrettably, the other side voted that down.

The second thing that is not made allowance for in this budget is fixing the Medicare payment imbalance. Forty-seven percent of physicians in my home State, in Washington, will not see new Medicare patients. Why? Because the fee-for-service rates under Medicare are unjust. This is the case in the Committee on the Budget chairman's home State of Iowa.

We had an opportunity to provide language in this bill to fix it. We managed to provide language to protect tax cuts, but we do not seem to be able to provide language to protect people for tax fairness, and we do not seem to be able to provide language to assure fair Medicare compensation rates.

I urge the people from those States to ask their Representatives, why have they left us out in the cold? Why have they not solved the sales tax inequity? Why have they not fixed the imbalance in Medicare payments?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the distinguished chair of our caucus.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his work.

The budget is more than a series of numbers. It is about priorities and values and visions and commitments. It is about the kind of America we want to build. It is about the kind of Nation we want to bequeath to our children. It is about the future.

Will we have a future of debts and deficits or a future with a balanced budget? Will we have a future where seniors have access to the medications they need, or one where they will have to choose between life-saving prescriptions and putting food on the table? Will we have a future where every child gets the education he or she deserves, or one where many children arrive into adulthood unprepared for the jobs and challenges of the 21st century? Will we have a future where Medicare and Social Security are there for our retirees, or one where the funding runs out? Will we have a future where our cities and States have funding they need to hire, train and supply our local first responders, our first line of defense against terrorism, or will we leave them and their communities defenseless? Will we have a future where our veterans have all of the benefits and services they need and deserve, or will

we have a future where their sacrifices go unappreciated?

On every single count, the Democratic plan provides a future where the priorities and values of the American people are met and fulfilled, and on every single count the Republican budget shortchanges these priorities of the American people by sacrificing them on the altar of a massive round of additional tax breaks and tax cuts. Their budget makes no fiscal sense, it makes no moral sense, and it makes no practical sense.

We are, as I speak, as we debate, at war. Our men and women in uniform are fighting for our way of life, and we all stand behind them in their mission, but the Republican budget cuts \$14.6 billion from mandatory veterans' benefits, including disability, burial benefits, pensions, rehabilitation, housing and education, and that is a disgrace, a disgrace. Our soldiers are fighting to protect our way of life, and Democrats believe we have a duty to protect them.

Fiscally irresponsible tax breaks are not the answer to every problem. I believe our way of life is about more than just tax giveaways. Our way of life is about educating our children, taking care of the needs of our seniors, and building an America we can all be proud of.

The Democratic budget takes care of these priorities. The Republican budget does not. It is that clear, it is that simple, and the choice for Members is to vote for a future with promise and hope, or vote for a future with massive debt and broken commitments.

I urge my colleagues to look into their hearts, make the right choice and support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me the time, and I want to agree with my friend from New Jersey, the previous speaker. This debate is about where our priorities are, and a budget is about where our priorities are in government, and we just have a disagreement on the floor of the House of Representatives. We have it year after year after year.

Clearly, my friends on the Democrat side of the aisle are willing to accept higher taxes so that Federal spending can increase at a faster and faster rate. That is their viewpoint. We, on the other hand, believe that tax restraint brings about economic growth and jobs, and that is a lot of what this debate is about tonight.

I have heard debate on this bill throughout the afternoon and evening, and I have heard things like the Republican budget slashes spending, we are taking hot meals away from schoolchildren, we are taking needed benefits away from our citizens, we are denying health care. Someone just said we are leaving people out in the cold. These are the very same arguments that we have heard year after year after year,

debate after debate, on the budget resolution.

□ 2200

I would submit to my colleagues that hot meals have not been taken away from school children, benefits have not been taken away from our citizens, we have not denied health care or left people out in the cold.

With regard to slashing spending, I would like Members to look at chart number 26 which shows spending trends. Since I became a Member of this Congress in 1995, spending has gone up at a quite remarkable rate. All we are asking with regard to discretionary spending from the year 2003 to the year 2004 is just a very, very modest breather. After that discretionary spending continues to increase at a pace which probably would embarrass some of our conservatives. But this is the definition of slashing spending for some of our colleagues. So we need to decide if that is exactly what this is.

Moving to the next chart, a statement was made about the Clinton tax increase, and I hope Members can see this. I have a different view and I have a different recollection about the Clinton tax increase and the result of it. When I got to Congress in the winter of 1995, President Clinton, who had just presided over a very large tax increase, came before the Congress and proposed his budget. I did not see a balanced budget at the end of that rainbow. I saw deficits as indicated on this line as far as the eye could see. As a matter of fact, under the Clinton budget after tax increases, the deficit would have gone up to \$288 billion per year.

Now Republicans in the House of Representatives and the Senate felt we could do a better job, and part of that solution was tax reductions. Indeed, we did reduce taxes. And guess what, we said we will balance the budget by restraining spending, by making some of those tough decisions which other people criticized as slashing and leaving people out in the cold. Lo and behold, in a shorter time than we even predicted, we had a balanced budget.

Looking at the last chart, we seek tax reduction for one reason and one reason only, to grow this economy. I want to remind Members of a time when we were spending a larger percentage of the gross domestic product on national defense than we are today, a larger percentage of the economy than we are having to do in this Iraq situation, and that was in 1981 and 1982 when President Reagan ushered in a very meaningful tax cut for the American people. Did we have to slash programs? As a matter of fact, revenue grew almost every year after the Reagan tax cuts because the economy grew. That is what we are trying to do with our tax policy here.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman put up the chart that was

up earlier showing Clintonomics versus the last chart and agree that perhaps spending grew in those years because revenue for the government grew as well, and perhaps that President and this Congress, Democrats and Republicans, did a darn good job of helping the economy to grow. Can the gentleman concede that point?

Mr. WICKER. Reclaiming my time, I would concede this, that President Reagan raised taxes and the very next year he was up here proposing deficits as far as the eye could see.

When we cut taxes, as President Reagan did, the economy grows. These are simply the facts. Revenues to the government grew because people had jobs and they were working. I urge a defeat of this Democrat proposal, and a "yes" vote on final passage.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me follow up on what the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) stated. I was here in 1993, and I voted for that. It was the hardest vote I ever made, but it worked. And it was not because of the Republican majorities in 1995. It was because of a bipartisan effort that we had a balanced budget and surpluses in the late 1990s. Now they are gone.

That is why I rise in opposition to the Republican budget and support the Spratt substitute amendment. This Republican budget does not provide enough. We know what we are going to have to pay for the military campaign in Iraq, which could range as high as \$100 billion, and which programs will have to be cut to underwrite that \$100 billion. What we know about this budget is it contains a monstrous tax cut that is paid for out of the expense of almost everything, including veterans, the war effort, prescription drugs for seniors. Let me repeat that. This tax cut affects some of the most critical entitlement programs, school lunches, student loans, veterans programs, and Medicaid and Medicare.

In my own committee, we are asked to cut \$107 billion out of Medicaid and literally give pennies to prescription drugs to seniors. That is why the Spratt substitute is so good.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, just to walk down memory lane, during the Clinton years, we created 21 million jobs. So far, during the Bush years, we have seen 2.5 million private sector jobs disappear. In December 2000 before President Clinton left office and President Bush took office, there were 5.17 million people unemployed. This year in January 2003, it is 8.4 million unemployed.

We can go down the list. Real GDP during the Clinton years increased at a rate of 6.3 percent from 1993 through 2000. So far it has increased at a rate of 1.5 percent, and the budget every year

from 1993 onward, the bottom line of the budget, the so-called deficit got better and better and better under that budget that we adopted in 1993. It went from a record deficit of \$290 billion in 1992 to \$255 billion the next year, \$203 billion the next year, \$164 billion in 1995, \$107 billion in 1996, \$22 billion in 1997, and balanced for the first time in 30 years in 1998. That was a record of that period of time and the result of that tough budget vote that we took in 1993.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, immoral. Immoral is the only word I can find to describe the Republican budget that is being forced down our throats this evening.

As we go to war, this Republican package includes exactly zero dollars towards the war effort. This budget includes exactly zero dollars to bolster our troops in Iraq and throughout the Middle East. And for our veterans, this Republican budget cuts funding for veterans disability pensions and veterans health care.

The Disabled American Veterans asked the question: Has Congress no shame? Unfortunately, as long as Republicans control this institution and force these types of budgets onto the American people, the answer is no, this Republican Congress has no shame.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I believe this budget is immoral, and that is the only word I can find to describe it. Tax cuts for the rich, cuts to veterans' pensions and health care and nothing for our troops. I say vote down this immoral Republican budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I know it is getting late. It is 10 p.m., but words like "immoral" and not providing money to our troops is just over the edge. Our troops are going to get all the money they need to do whatever they have to do to protect themselves and achieve their objective. There is no one here doubts that issue. Not one Member. To suggest otherwise, I think particularly tonight, is inappropriate. I do not think that we need to go there.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) said that States are having to make cuts, and you do not see why it is not possible that we in this Congress cannot take a 1 percent across-the-board cut.

I could accept that, but the only problem is where the gentleman did not cite the difference between the States and us is that they are not parading around talking about tax cuts in Tennessee, Connecticut, Michigan, Florida and New Mexico.

Mr. SHAYS. Reclaiming my time, I understand there is an objection to the

tax cuts. I understand that debate is going to be one in which we will disagree. We happen to believe that tax cuts generate economic activity. We have an honest disagreement on that issue.

I am just saying in this debate tonight when our men and women are fighting to even suggest for a moment that our troops are not going to get all of the resources they need is simply going over the edge. I would just suggest that we both know that we need to provide our men and women with everything they need, and our job is to make sure it is never a fair fight, that we always have the advantage, and we have done that.

I think the gentleman would acknowledge that this side of the aisle has continually put more money into the defense budget. That is what we continue to do today. I just would make this point. Our men and women are going to get whatever they need, and we are going to have a supplemental that impacts this budget, not next year's budget. They will get whatever they need to do their job and win this war.

We have disagreements. Our disagreements are we are putting more money in defense and homeland security. We believe a meaningful tax cut, one that is noticeable and large, will strengthen the economy and create jobs; and we believe that a 1 percent cut on non-defense, nonhomeland security discretionary spending, 1 percent for 1 year will make sense. What my colleague from South Carolina did not point out is during the late 1990s, we slowed the growth in spending for 2, almost 3, years, and then allowed it to go up again. We believe that is why our budget balanced. We are going to have disagreements on that.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enthusiastically support the Spratt substitute amendment on the budget because of its commitment to child care, education, Medicare and Medicaid, and because it helps ease the pain of working Americans.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican's proposed budget resolution for fiscal year 2004 and in support of the Spratt substitute amendment. If passed, the budget resolution currently before the House would require the Committee on Education and the Workforce to cut

mandatory spending programs under its jurisdiction by \$269 million for fiscal year 2004 and \$2.675 billion for fiscal years 2004 through 2008. This is completely unacceptable. Education is the key to success.

The Federal cuts come at a time when States are facing a severe budget crisis. According to the National Governors' Association, States face a combined \$80 billion budget shortfall for fiscal year 2004 in addition to a \$30 billion shortfall for the current fiscal year.

In my State of Texas, they are suffering from at least a \$10 billion shortfall in this 2-year period.

As I see it, all of these cuts to essential educational programs are being made only to benefit the wealthiest Americans—the top 1%—through tax cuts. The President and the Republican party insist on cutting taxes far beyond any reasonable amount at a time when we are at war with Iraq and will need to occupy Iraq for years to come to maintain the peace and rebuild the country. They are acting irresponsibly by failing to include the projected cost of the war and its aftermath in this current budget resolution. The cost of the war alone has been estimated at anywhere from \$70 billion to \$200 billion, according to the Administration's former economic advisor, Lawrence Lindsay.

The Republican budget also cuts \$28 billion in health care and disability benefits for military veterans again to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans less than 24 hours after sending our forces into battle. They should be ashamed of themselves. It is unconscionable for the Republicans to be cutting taxes and reducing social services programs at a time when the United States has a large and growing deficit, our states are in crises, and we are at war with Iraq. History will not be kind when it judges the Republicans' actions.

There is a far better alternative budget. Congressman SPRATT's Democratic substitute offers real economic stimulus and job creation. It proposes responsible tax policy by continuing the implementation of middle-income tax cuts, such as the increased child tax credit, and by freezing tax cuts for the top two income tax brackets. The Spratt substitute meets our nation's domestic needs by providing over \$200 billion more in domestic investments than the Republican budget. It fully funds priority investments such as No Child Left Behind, IDEA, veteran's benefits, children's services, public health, transportation, environmental programs and agricultural programs. This alternative also invests in health care and a strong prescription drug plan by providing at least \$20 billion to cover the uninsured and at least \$528 billion for a prescription drug program under Medicare, while allowing senior citizens to stay with their current doctors. Finally, the Spratt alternative budget invests in Homeland Security and defense funding by increasing resources for Homeland Defense and by giving \$20 billion more to First Responders than they would receive under the Republican Budget. In short, the Spratt Budget provides for America's needs, the needs of our people and strengthens our economy. It is a sound, reasonable budget blueprint, and we should support it.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican's proposed budget resolution is inherently flawed. It hurts

the education system in the United States. It harms children's programs. It damages small businesses, which are the strength of the U.S. economy, and it insults our veterans and our troops fighting in Iraq. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Spratt substitute and oppose the irresponsible, illogical, and ill-advised Republican budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) mentioned not tonight, we do not walk the talk about what is happening to our veterans and military tonight. What better time to pull the covers off and show exactly what this Republican Party is doing for our veterans.

□ 2215

How in the name of any degree of decency and respect can we, on a day that will certainly live in infamy in the hearts of veterans, on a day and a time that we are sending our men and women into battle, what reward do we want to give our veterans who had to remember a day in infamy 60 years ago? What do we want to give them? A \$17 billion cut for veterans.

I represent the State of Georgia. I say to my friends in the Republican Party, and I want you to know that every weekend I go home that my office is lined with veterans with tears in their eyes, saying, how could they be so mean? Every year in campaigns my Republican friends run around the country, and they talk about conservative compassion. This is not conservative compassion. This is downright conservative meanness. These veterans do not appreciate it. This is why I say, let us support the Democratic budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, as a Democrat who voted for the 2001 Bush tax cut, I am here tonight to say that I would never support a vote for this Republican budget proposal. The Republican budget completely abandons the goal of a balanced budget. It embraces deficits and debt. It slashes critical programs for our working families, and it is fiscally irresponsible. The Republican budget would mean a cut of hundreds of millions of dollars from Nevada's hospitals and health care providers due to cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. Nevada already has a health care crisis. We cannot afford these cuts in medical care for our elderly and our poor.

The Republican budget eliminates after-school programs for over 2,900 children in Nevada. Southern Nevada has one of the highest dropout rates in the country. Abandoning these kids who are struggling to stay in school would be a disaster. The Republican budget cuts almost 8 percent from highway funding. In Nevada, the fastest-growing State in the country, this translates into a \$16 million cut and

represents a loss of more than 760 construction jobs for Nevada.

At a time that our Nation is going to war, the Republican budget cuts \$28 million from the veterans budget. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Spratt proposal and not the Republican budget debacle.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, there are words we should remember. There are quotes worth quoting again. Here is one:

"If we are to prevail in the long run, we must expand the long-run strength of our economy. We must move along the path to a higher rate of growth and full employment."

"For this would mean tens of billions of dollars more for each year in production, profits, wages and public revenues. It would mean an end to the persistent slack which has kept our unemployment at or above 5 percent for 61 of the past 62 months."

"To achieve these greater gains, one step, above all, is essential, the enactment this year of a substantial reduction and revision in Federal income taxes."

"For it is increasingly clear, to those in government, business and labor who are responsible for our economy's success, that our obsolete tax system exerts too heavy a drag on private purchasing power, profits and employment. Designed to check inflation in early years, it now checks growth instead. It discourages extra effort and risk. It distorts the use of resources. It invites recurrent recessions, depresses our Federal revenues, and causes chronic budget deficits."

"This net reduction in tax liabilities will increase the purchasing power of American families and business enterprises in every tax bracket, with the greatest increase going to our low-income consumers. It will, in addition, encourage the initiative and risk-taking on which our free system depends, induce more investment, production and capacity use, help provide the 2 million new jobs we need every year, and reinforce the American principle of additional reward for additional effort."

Mr. Chairman, there are Democrats that we should quote, there are Democratic words that we should remember, and those that I have just quoted came from the Democratic President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in his State of the Union message in 1963.

There is a contemporary Democrat who offers to his party also very good advice. It, of course, is Democrat Bill Richardson from the State of New Mexico, who says that "reducing taxes," and this year he is talking about, this is not in 1963, he is talking about 2003, "reducing taxes puts us on the road to economic growth." His plan reduces New Mexico's income tax by 40 percent, from the current 8.2 percent to 4.9 percent. He agrees that his plan sounds

sort of like the Bush tax-cutting agenda.

All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is this. There was a time when the Democratic Party could be counted on to do the right thing for the government, to do the right thing regardless of whether or not you could make a class envy debate out of this thing. They knew it was the right thing to do. It was the right thing to do when the President of the United States said so in 1963, it is the right thing to do today when the Democratic Governor of New Mexico says to do it, and I encourage this body to do it by striking down this substitute and supporting the underlying amendment.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would remind my good friend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) that Governor Richardson in New Mexico, we applaud him for what he has done.

There are many on this side who believe that tax cuts should be a viable part of any stimulus plan. The only problem is the tax cut that you propose we do not believe will actually stimulate very much, nor will it help us to achieve the balanced budgets that my friend the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) claims he wants, and I believe that he actually wants, even though he was a bit condescending when he told me to shut up a few seconds ago.

I will say this to my friend, Bill Richardson and other Governors across this Nation, Bill Richardson was here a few days ago along with Governor Bush and another Governor, talking about Medicaid dollars and complaining to this Congress that the cuts we are imposing on his hospitals in his State as well as Governor Bush's State and other States are far too onerous.

All we ask on this side is that we be honest about the moment we face. Many of us on this side have rallied behind this President and our Commander in Chief in this effort against Iraq and this war on terrorism. I resent my friend the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), for whom I have great affection, for some of the words. I understand the passion sometimes, it happens to me, it gets to us and perhaps allows our words to get away from us. I am sure he did not mean some of the personal things he said this evening.

Our budget, I believe, we believe, is better for the country than yours. It is about priorities. Next election cycle we will see who is right, but I can tell this to the gentleman from Connecticut, I want to win this war, I want to see this economy grow, and I can assure you that everyone on this side of the aisle wants that as well. We just think our budget is better.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, here is the dilemma we are faced with. If this budget passes

and becomes real, which I doubt, it will be devastating to our children and their education, to our seniors and their security, and to some of the most worthy citizens we know, sick and disabled veterans. On the other hand, if it passes and does not become real, if those cuts are not actually made, then it will devastate the bottom line of our budget.

Those of us who have been here a long time can tell you how intractable deep deficits can become. For 15 years we struggled to get ourselves in surplus, and in 2 years we have blown it. That is why we are out here intensely tonight fighting. Important principles are at stake.

I have to say to my colleague and wonderful friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), when I first saw this budget on the day of markup, I said, "It ain't on the level. I can't take it at face value." The better I understand it, the less credence I give it. I honestly think it is just a clever device for passing another round of tax cuts as large as the last, \$1.35 trillion, despite the fact that this time there is no surplus. It goes straight to the bottom line and increases the deficit.

Here the numbers are displayed on this chart. If you want a choice between us and them, here it is, Mr. Chairman. Here it is, colleagues. Our budget every year has a lower and lower deficit until the year 2010 when it is no longer in deficit, it is in surplus. We put the budget back in surplus. That is our driving purpose. The first parameter we set for ourselves was we are going to get to balance in a reasonable period of time, and that date turned out to be 2010.

If you compare the Republican chart, you will see they do not get to balance until the year 2012, 2 years later, and that depends, Mr. Chairman, on some stupendous cost-cutting around here. I have been here 20 years. I just do not think that they are going to be able to accomplish it.

I heard these colloquies over here on the House floor. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), one of the ablest Members of this House, chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, he had a colloquy that, in effect, said, you don't expect me really to get \$40 billion out of government retirement pensions, do you? The answer was basically, no, you've got other mandatory programs. You can reform procurement, for example, and save \$40 billion.

Give me a break. That is not going to happen. This is a serious, serious effort and exercise, because if we are wrong here, we will live with the consequences for a long, long time.

We have before us a real choice to this budget which we have brought to the House floor from the House Budget Committee. We have got a choice that is a far better choice, the Democratic substitute. It is a fiscally sound choice because our budget balances in 2010; theirs balances in 2012. Our budget

racks up less debt during that 10-year time frame, \$913 billion less debt, and, listen to this, \$1.647 trillion less debt than the President's budget.

Our budget is fair and sensible. The Democratic budget weighs priorities. The Republican budget wreaks havoc. Indeed, much of our budget is devoted to restoring the damage the Republican budget does.

The Republican budget cuts education and training by \$60 billion. It flat-funds Leave No Child Behind, even though the authorizing act calls for \$9 billion next year. We restore that cut and add to the education function.

The Republican resolution wipes out Justice Department programs like community policing. We can all attest to its effectiveness. It drops and cuts out Byrne grants. It drops level funding for these Justice Department programs by \$35 billion. Do you know who you are cutting when you are doing that? The famous first responders. These people that we talk about, but do so little for, they are the victims. We do not stand for that in our budget. We restore those programs because we think this is the first line of homeland defense, and we put \$24 billion more in our budget than they do for homeland security.

We have heard it charged on the floor today that our budget increases spending. Let me just lay that argument to rest once and for all with a chart that is taken straight from the numbers in our budget. As you can see, this year we are spending about 20.4 percent total spending of GDP. Following the path laid down by our budget, that will decline to 19.1 percent of GDP in 2013. In the years 2004 through 2013, the 10-year time frame of this budget, our spending will grow by 4.6 percent over that 10-year period of time. That will be the annual rate of growth. That is less than the GDP nominal growth rate.

Let me finally say that our bill also has in it something that is critically important. We have got a weak, wobbly economy. We have got in our bill the stimulus package, which we think is an excellent package. It was offered by us on January 6 of this year. We say, let us enact it. Let us help those who are unemployed, let us give this economy a kick, let us give those who are likely to spend it a rebate straight to their pockets. It will be spent on the economy. Let us give small businesses extra expensing. Let us help large businesses by saying, if you will do something in 2003, we will give you a 50 percent depreciation.

It is dramatic, it is bold, and when you compare it by any of the established economic models, we get two to three times the results in GDP growth and job creation that the Republicans get for spending six times as much money in their jobs and growth package.

We have a real choice, a stark choice today, and far better the choice is our Democratic substitute. Vote for the

Spratt substitute. Vote for the Democratic substitute. It is the best choice by far.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this Democrat budget. I find it fascinating that we have so much angst about the deficit on this side of the aisle. I have a lot of angst about the deficit. I do not want to leave our children a legacy of debt. I have a 1-year-old. I want to leave them a legacy of freedom and opportunity. But, Mr. Chairman, the tax relief in the Republican package accounts for less than 5 percent of this budget.

□ 2230

If there is so much angst over the deficit, why does the Democrat budget not focus on 95 percent of the problem, which is spending? Our budget increases spending, increases it by 3 percent. How much is enough? Over 5 years we have increased the VA, HUD, and independent agencies by 35.7 percent, Transportation by almost 80 percent, HHS by 96 percent. If every Government program was so great for the American people, why do we not simply double these budgets? Why do we not triple these budgets? Why do we not quadruple the budgets? Why do we not tell the American people to quit sending us State, local, and Federal taxes of 40 percent? Why do they not just send it all to us?

The point we are making is that good things can be done perhaps outside of this Government. I mean, the Democrats talk and accuse us of cutting programs. It is their budget that cuts education programs. It is their budget that cuts housing programs because in our budget we help American families pay for their programs. Our budget is going to allow 46 million married couples to keep over \$1,700 more of what they earn. That is enough to pay two mortgage payments. That is a housing program and the Democrat budget cuts it.

Under our budget, 34 million families with children would keep an additional \$1,500, enough to purchase a personal computer for their children. That is an education program and the Democrat budget cuts it. Six million single mothers would keep \$541. That is enough to purchase a month of daycare. That is a childcare program. And the Democrat budget cuts it.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot tax our way into prosperity, spend our way into prosperity, or sue our way into prosperity; and we need to reject this Democrat budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his distinguished leadership in putting together the Spratt proposal this evening.

I rise in strong support of the Spratt budget resolution and in opposition to the Republican budget on the floor tonight. I want to congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his great leadership. I also want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for his leadership on the Congressional Black Caucus budget and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for his leadership on the Blue Dog budget. All three of these Democratic budgets are far superior to the Republican proposal.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that our Federal budget should be a statement of our national values. We should allocate our resources to those proposals that are important to us.

Let me ask my colleagues, is it a statement of your values to cut funding in the education of our children in order to give a tax cut to the wealthiest in America? I did not think so. America's children deserve better.

Is it a statement of your values to give a meager drug prescription benefit and cut nursing home care to America's seniors while giving the most of the tax breaks to those who need it least? I did not think so either. America's seniors deserve better.

Is it a statement of your values to cut funding for America's disabled veterans and not include one penny for a war budget as we send our young men and women into harm's way? America's veterans and servicemen and women deserve better.

Is it a statement of your values to underfund Homeland Security while we are on high alert? The American people deserve better.

The Republican budget is clearly not a statement of our national values. It explodes the deficit, fails to create jobs, and fails to invest in the education and health care initiatives that this country needs for long-term economic growth.

I commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his masterful leadership in developing a Democratic budget that creates jobs, in fact, 1 million new jobs this year. The Spratt proposal balances the budget, sparks economic growth, funds the priorities of working families, education for their children, prescription drugs for their parents and grandparents, health care for our veterans, and resources for the police and firefighters who protect our communities.

This Democratic budget invests in our children. The Republican budget indebts them. This Democratic budget gives the American people the responsible budget they deserve. The Republican budget is reckless and irresponsible. On every measure important to working families, the Democratic budget is better.

We will fight this unconscionable Republican budget at every opportunity. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on Spratt.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is getting late. I know we are going to have a 2-hour dialogue of strong support for our men and women in battle. I would like to conclude by making a number of points, but not using all my time.

First, there is really no one I respect more on either side of the aisle than the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and I appreciate the graciousness in which he does his business and the conviction with which he expresses it and the work that he and his staff and his members do.

My comments are meant to just explain differences and not to describe character; but when we were debating this bill last week, we looked at amendments to the budget that only increase spending. We did not see any Democratic amendment that cuts spending. Admittedly, they reduce the tax cuts and therefore added more taxes than we would have. That is true. But there was \$1 trillion of more spending, and I would submit that during the 20 years that my colleague talks about serving in this Congress, the only time he ever saw Congress balance the budget was under a Republican Congress. He never saw it happen under a Democratic Congress. He never saw a debt paid back under a Democratic Congress. So I understand that we have clearly been very proud of the fact that we on the Republican side of the aisle, working with Democrats, balanced the budget and started to pay down debt and now we have gone in a different direction.

It does not surprise me, though. The economy has slowed down. We had a horrific attack on September 11, 2001, that I think most people know had an impact on the budget. Ten percent of our gross domestic product came to a standstill with the airline industry and tourism. So we all understand that. We just have a difference in how we generate economic activity because both sides recognize that we ultimately balance the budget by growing this economy and getting more revenue. That is what we know happened. And the difference is a 1 percent reduction in mandatory and discretionary nondefense, nonhomeland security, non-Social Security, non-Medicare that we think is something that grown men and women can do. And when my colleagues on that side of the aisle ascribe a cut in a particular part of the budget, what they had to do was they had to assume that we were going to cut more than 1 percent and where we were going to make that cut was in the particular area they wanted.

The disadvantage we have is that we decided to allow the appropriators to make that decision, unlike what we did in the Committee on the Budget I was on a few years ago in 1996 and 1997 where we specified those cuts, we said the appropriators can make those decisions, and I am absolutely certain that in most instances described on the other side of the aisle, those cuts would not be made there. That is what I believe because we are talking about a 1

percent cut in 1 year and then we allow the budget to grow the next year and the next year and the next year and the next year. Nine years we allow it to grow, but our logic is make the reductions this year because then we see benefit in all the years that follow.

Maybe it is hard here, but when I was in the Statehouse and on the Committee on Appropriations for 13 years, we sometimes had to reduce the budget by 5 percent or more; and what we did is we sat down with the department heads and said, This is what we have got to do, where would you like the cuts to be? We met with our version of GAO and said, Where do you think it should be? Our version of the Inspector Generals, and we put it all together, and we came down with where we thought the cuts should be. A 1 percent reduction 1 year is what we are asking for.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would just say we do want to protect America. We do want to increase the defense budget and homeland security, and we do. We do want to strengthen the economy and create jobs. We do it by a tax cut. On the other side of the aisle, you do it by spending increases and a much smaller tax cut, and we ultimately want to balance the budget and now your budget will balance 2 years sooner under a static model. We believe under a dynamic model when we restrain spending and we have tax cuts, we will see it balance sooner.

We saw that happen in 1990. We did not get credit in 1990 when we had our 7-year plan to balance the budget. The CBO would not give us credit, but we balanced it in 3 years, 4 years sooner than we thought.

You may not agree with what I have said, but that is the reality as we see it, and that is the differences we have, and they are honest disagreements; but the one thing we do not have a disagreement on, and that is what I was trying to explain to my colleague. Our men and women are going to get whatever they need to win whatever war they are fighting and to make sure it is never a fair battle. On that Republicans and Democrats are totally and completely united. Totally and completely.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the budget proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT. The Republican majority of the House Budget Committee approved a federal budget reducing funding for veterans' health care and benefit programs by nearly \$25 billion. The actual spending impact of these cuts would be even greater.

Over a ten-year period the GOP is proposing a cut of almost \$9 billion in veterans' health care—an average of more than \$900 million less than the President has proposed per year. For other veterans' benefits, including cash payments to veterans disabled by military service, the Republican budget calls for a \$15 billion cut in spending from current levels during the next ten years.

In sharp contrast to the Republican's proposal, the Committee on Veterans Affairs, on

a bipartisan basis, recommended adding \$3 billion to the President's budget next year for veteran discretionary programs including medical care and research, construction, and programs that fund the administrative costs of other important benefits such as compensation, pension, and education programs. A group of Veterans Service Organizations who support the Independent Budget also recommend an increase over the President's budget of almost that much.

The Republicans also spurned other efforts to increase funding for the nation's veterans. An amendment in the Budget Committee offered by DARLENE HOOLEY to add \$1 billion for veterans' health care and restore cuts in mandatory programs was voted down on a largely party-line vote.

Passing the Republican's budget will mean serious problems for veterans' health care. Among them, Congress will have to seriously consider the new copayments and enrollment fees proposed by the Bush Administration in order to keep the system operating in the next fiscal year. Some of these proposals include retaining the ineligibility for new Priority 8 veterans for VA health care services indefinitely, requiring Priority 7 and 8 veterans to have an annual enrollment fee in addition to increased copayments for pharmaceutical drugs and primary care and providing only veterans with highly rated service-connected disabilities (more than 70 percent) VA Nursing Home care.

In addition, passage of the Republican's budget would mean there would be no additional funds available to implement the Homeless Veterans Comprehensive Assistance Act to work toward the goal of elimination chronic homelessness in a decade. It would also mean that the current exercise Capital Assets Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) that VA is undertaking to assess the best use of its physical infrastructure will become a "de facto" closure commission with no ability to respond to veterans' needs for primary care, long-term care, and mental health projected by its own models. There would be little money leftover for any of the system's desperately needed construction projects.

As serious as the problems for health care would be, the implications of the scheduled cuts for veterans' benefits would be even worse. The Administration's Budget for 2004 makes no provision for additional service-connected disability benefits resulting from the present war with Iraq. As we know from the last war in the Persian Gulf, war results in adverse health effects and justifiable claims for service connected disability compensation. It does acknowledge the expected increase in veteran's claims and an expected worsening of the disabilities of some service-connected veterans. Under these circumstances, cuts in mandatory spending can only be made by cutting benefits to veterans with service-connected disabilities.

Ninety percent of the mandatory spending the Budget Committee proposes to cut is from cash payments to service disabled veterans, low-income wartime veterans and their survivors. I do not believe that as our young men and women are fighting in Iraq and defending freedom in other parts of the world, we should pass a budget which will not fully compensate them for any disabilities they acquire during, or as a result of, that service.

Other programs funded with mandatory spending are the Montgomery G.I. Bill edu-

cation benefits, vocational rehabilitation and independent living programs for service-disabled veterans, subsidies for VA home loans and insurance for service-disabled veterans and funds to provide headstones, markers and flags for deceased veterans.

As our Nation enters a war certain to result in disability and death for young Americans, the Budget Committee's proposed requires the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to make permanent cuts in the benefits paid to those disabled by virtue of their service to our Nation. These cuts must be made, so that our government can afford to provide a tax cut which will benefit only the wealthiest Americans, many of whom have never served in the military.

In contrast, Mr. SPRATT's amendment would restore the cut for benefits and health care and add \$200 million to the VA health care budget.

I ask you now, who deserves to receive the benefits of the national treasury—America's disabled veterans or America's millionaires? I urge my colleagues to vote for the Spratt amendment.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, at a time when our federal budget faces huge deficits and we are engaged in a large military campaign halfway around the globe, now is not the time to slash taxes. Never in the history of our country have we fought a major war and cut taxes at the same time. Yet that is exactly what the Republican budget resolution does. These serious times demand that we act prudently, and that means we must pass a budget that meets our financial obligations.

The Republican budget makes permanent the \$1.35 trillion tax cut passed in 2001, at a cost of \$523 billion. It also implements the \$694 billion "Growth" bill, the centerpiece of which is the elimination of the dividend tax. This plan will fail to spark an economic turnaround because it applies to only 25% of the population and less than 5% of the benefits take place this year when the economy needs it the most. According to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, a similar tax cut proposed by the Administration would add \$2.2 trillion in deficits over the next 5 years.

Because the first priority of the Republican budget is to cut taxes, programs dedicated to health care, education, and the environment suffer drastic cuts. To make room for tax cuts, at least \$265 billion over ten years is slashed from programs like veterans' benefits, loans for college students, school lunch programs, and Medicaid.

Most concerning is that we really don't know how much the military operations and our occupation of Iraq will cost, but we do know that the U.S. alone will carry the tremendous burden of that responsibility. Estimates vary widely, and the lowest, most optimistic figure is \$80 billion. With that enormous figure added to this year's deficit of \$304 billion, common sense dictates that we refrain from additional tax cuts and return fiscal sanity to the budget process.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic budget alternative, which offers a sound, practical way to stimulate economic activity while paying down the debt and saving critical social programs. The Democratic proposal includes \$136 billion in tax cuts and targeted investments this year. At less than one-sixth the cost of the Republican "Growth" bill, the plan allows the budget to recover while giving the

economy the immediate boost it so desperately needs.

The Democratic alternative ensures that critical social services will continue to be provided at their current levels by restoring the cuts made in the Republican Resolution. It also provides \$528 billion in new money for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, while the Republican proposal only offers \$128 billion. The Democratic measure allocates \$34 billion more for homeland security and \$60 billion more for education over the next ten years, adds \$10 billion more to help working families with child care over five years, and protects funding for Low Income Heating Energy Assistance Program, Women Infants and Children Nutrition, housing programs and other important initiatives.

If we pass another round of irresponsibly large tax cuts, government deficits will spiral out of control, especially as war increases our overall spending. We cannot saddle our children and grandchildren with this debt—we must decide now to adhere to the principals of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we take up this budget debate at a moment of great national challenge. The men and women of our armed forces have begun military action in Iraq. We wish them a swift and successful end to hostilities with a minimum loss of life on all sides. At this moment, when they are demonstrating such courage and sacrifice, we here at home must make responsible decisions about the kind of America we want for them and our children. The decisions we make tonight will affect the well being of our troops and all Americans for years to come. We must make important decisions about the future economic health of our nation and what investments we decide to make for the common good.

We need to adopt an economic plan that will put America back to work and a budget that reflects the priorities of the American people. Just as each family must make tough decisions about their own household budgets, so must we make tough decisions for our entire American family. How we decide to invest our collective resources should tell us a lot about what we care about as a people and who we are. The budgets and economic plans we adopt should reflect the values and priorities of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the people in my district. I think I understand their priorities. And I believe that what they care about is what every American cares about. They want a country where every child has the opportunity to get a great start in life with a first rate education. They want a country where every American has access to quality health care. They want an America where there is a job for every individual ready to roll up their sleeves and go to work. And they want to know that their government is taking all reasonable steps to protect our homeland and be prepared to respond to national emergencies. These are the simple things we want for our families, our neighbors and our fellow Americans.

We are a great nation. We can do these things. Unfortunately, the Republican budget before us does not begin to meet the needs and priorities of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, just a short time ago I had the privilege of sitting in this chamber when the President gave his State of the Union address. At the outset of his speech, he made the following statement: "We will not deny, we

will not ignore, we will not pass along our problems to other Congresses, to other Presidents and other generations."

Unfortunately, neither the budget submitted by the President nor the Republican Budget Committee proposal before us today passes that test. In fact the budget before us today does exactly what the President says he does not want to do. It does ignore our problems and, if we don't fix those problems we will be simply passing the buck to future Congresses, future Presidents, and future generations.

Look at education. Last year, with great fanfare, the President signed the Leave No Child Behind bill at the White House. Yet the ink was barely dry before the administration submitted a budget that fell well short of the promised funding. Well, when you leave the funding behind, you leave millions of children behind with nothing but broken promises. And the Republican proposal falls \$9 billion short—almost 25 percent—of the funds authorized. That is a terrible message to send to our school children and teachers.

Look at health care. The Republican budget contains no meaningful proposal to address the problem of the 41 million Americans who have no health insurance. Apparently the Republican budget proposes to leave this problem to future Congresses and generations.

How about domestic security? The Republican's proposed budget ignores many of the needs outlined by the agency heads at the U.S. Customs Service, the Coast Guard, the Department of Energy and elsewhere. They have said they need far more resources to meet the threat than what is proposed in the Republican budget.

So what have the House Republicans proposed? What is their top domestic priority? Another huge tax cut that overwhelmingly benefits the super wealthy. Like the President, the House Republicans have decided that the most pressing domestic problem—the one issue that cannot wait—is that the super wealthy are paying too much in taxes. That comes on the heels of the \$1.4 trillion tax cut from 2001 that disproportionately benefits the very wealthy.

And what will be the result of the Republican tax cut plan directed mostly to the wealthy? Even administration officials have conceded that it will do virtually nothing to stimulate the economy right now. The real result will be rivers of red ink and rising interest rates. The Republican plan would result in a \$324 billion deficit this year and lead to one of the sharpest reversals in America's fiscal fortunes in history. And that doesn't even include one penny of the cost of the ongoing war with Iraq and its aftermath. The President's policies would take us from a projected \$5.6 trillion surplus over 10 years to a projected \$2.1 trillion deficit. The Republican Budget Committee proposal masks these long-term deficits by calling for huge and unrealistic cuts. The actual result of their tax cut proposals will be exploding deficits.

Who's going to pick up the tab for this growing mountain of debt? The American people of course. It's simple. There are only two ways to deal with it in the long run. Either we substantially raise taxes on the next generation or we dramatically cut the areas of largest expenditure—Social Security and Medicare. Already, funds from the Social Security trust fund are going to pay for the President's last round of tax cuts. Remember that "lock box?" Well, the lock has been picked and the raid is on. The Republican budget plan makes the problem

even worse. It is a guided missile aimed at the heart of Social Security. And its not just money in the trust fund that will be lost; we will also lose the trust of the American people.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned with the reckless economic course proposed in the Republican budget. It does exactly what the President said in his State of the Union that he does not want to do—it ignores our very real current needs, and passes on the burdens of huge tax cuts to Social Security, Medicare and future Congresses and generations. I believe the Republican budget plan is out of touch with the true hopes and aspirations of the American people.

We have an obligation to confront our needs squarely now. We need to talk straight to the American people. The Democratic budget alternatives we are debating tonight all reflect the values and priorities of the American people better than the Republican plan. They correct the serious defects in the proposed Republican budget. All of them provide a great national investment in education, health care, homeland security, and prescription drug coverage for seniors. And they all do so without running up the huge deficits and debt contained in the Republican plan.

One shortcoming in the Democratic plans, however, is that—although they all provide a greater investment in our children's education than the Republican proposal, none of them reach the full level of funding promised in the Leave No Child Behind legislation. Full funding for Leave No Child Behind, IDEA and the other educational commitments we have made must be a top priority. I will continue to press for a budget that keeps all the promises we have made America's children.

While I am disappointed that the Democratic alternatives do not provide for full funding of these educational commitments, they come far closer than the Republican proposal. They also meet many other needs that are neglected in the Republican budget. I hope this Congress will adopt an economic plan and a budget that reflects the true priorities of the American people and does not pass the buck to future generations.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I support the Democratic budget and I reject the Republican budget.

The Democratic Budget invests in education and training. Our budget provides \$3.2 billion more for education and training than the GOP budget in FY 2004 alone. Over the next 10 years the Democratic budget provides \$44 billion more than the GOP budget. These budget increases mean increased funding for No Child Left Behind programs which reduce class sizes and provide advanced training for teachers.

The Democratic Budget also invests more in discretionary health care programs than the GOP Budget. The Democratic budget provides \$2.9 billion more for discretionary health care in FY 2004, and \$27.8 billion more over the next 10 years than the Republican Budget. Programs such as health professions training, rural health programs, Ryan White AIDS activities, and Healthy Start will be the direct beneficiaries of the Democratic Budget proposal.

The Democratic Budget is also preferable to the GOP Budget in Veterans' Health Care. The Democratic Budget provides \$23

billion more than the GOP budget over the next 10 years for Veterans' programs. It provides \$17 billion more for discretionary veterans' programs. It provides \$15 billion more for mandatory veterans' programs—where the GOP budget cuts \$15 billion from mandatory veterans' programs.

Finally, the Democrats budget call for spending \$34 billion more than the GOP budget on Homeland Security over the next 11 years. One the other hand, the GOP budget freezes homeland security funding at the 2003 level. The Democratic budget, for example, would ensure that \$3.5 billion in desperately-needed new money would be available for police officer, firefighters and emergency medical personnel. The GOP budget does not.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 236, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

AYES—192

Abercrombie	Emanuel	Lowey
Ackerman	Engel	Lynch
Alexander	Eshoo	Majette
Allen	Etheridge	Maloney
Andrews	Evans	Markley
Baca	Farr	Matsui
Baird	Fattah	McCarthy (MO)
Baldwin	Filner	McCarthy (NY)
Ballance	Ford	McCollum
Becerra	Frank (MA)	McDermott
Bell	Frost	McGovern
Berkley	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Berman	Gordon	McNulty
Berry	Green (TX)	Meehan
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Meek (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)
Blumenauer	Hall	Menendez
Boswell	Harman	Michaud
Boucher	Hastings (FL)	Millender
Boyd	Hill	McDonald
Brady (PA)	Hinchey	Miller (NC)
Brown (OH)	Hinojosa	Miller, George
Brown, Corrine	Hoefel	Mollohan
Capps	Holden	Moore
Capuano	Holt	Moran (VA)
Cardin	Honda	Nadler
Cardoza	Hooley (OR)	Napolitano
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Case	Inslee	Oberstar
Clay	Israel	Obey
Clyburn	Jackson-Lee	Olver
Conyers	(TX)	Ortiz
Cooper	Jefferson	Owens
Crowley	John	Pallone
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
Davis (AL)	Jones (OH)	Pastor
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Payne
Davis (FL)	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Davis (TN)	Kilpatrick	Pomeroy
DeFazio	Kind	Price (NC)
DeGette	Kleczka	Rahall
Delahunt	Kucinich	Rangel
DeLauro	Lampson	Reyes
Deutsch	Langevin	Rodriguez
Dicks	Lantos	Ross
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Rothman
Doggett	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Dooley (CA)	Levin	Ruppersberger
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Edwards	Lofgren	Ryan (OH)

Sabo	Smith (WA)
Sanchez, Linda	Snyder
T.	Solis
Sanchez, Loretta	Spratt
Sanders	Stark
Sandlin	Stenholm
Schakowsky	Strickland
Schiff	Stupak
Scott (GA)	Tanner
Scott (VA)	Tauscher
Serrano	Thompson (CA)
Sherman	Thompson (MS)
Skellton	Tierney
Slaughter	Towns

NOES—236

Aderholt	Gerlach	Norwood
Akin	Gibbons	Nunes
Bachus	Gilchrest	Nussle
Baker	Gillmor	Osborne
Ballenger	Gingrey	Ose
Barrett (SC)	Goode	Otter
Bartlett (MD)	Goodlatte	Oxley
Barton (TX)	Goss	Paul
Bass	Granger	Pearce
Beauprez	Graves	Pence
Bereuter	Green (WI)	Peterson (PA)
Biggert	Greenwood	Petri
Billirakis	Gutknecht	Pickering
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Pitts
Blackburn	Hart	Platts
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Pombo
Boehlert	Hayes	Porter
Boehner	Hayworth	Portman
Bonilla	Hefley	Pryce (OH)
Bonner	Hensarling	Putnam
Bono	Herger	Quinn
Boozman	Hobson	Radanovich
Bradley (NH)	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Brady (TX)	Hostettler	Regula
Brown (SC)	Houghton	Rehberg
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Renzi
Ginny	Hunter	Reynolds
Burgess	Isakson	Rogers (AL)
Burns	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Burr	Istook	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Jackson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Janklow	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Jenkins	Royce
Cannon	Johnson (CT)	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Ryun (KS)
Capito	Johnson, Sam	Saxton
Carson (OK)	Jones (NC)	Schrock
Carter	Kanjorski	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Keller	Sessions
Chabot	Kelly	Shadeegg
Chocola	Kennedy (MN)	Shaw
Coble	King (IA)	Shays
Cole	King (NY)	Sherwood
Collins	Kingston	Shimkus
Combest	Kirk	Shuster
Costello	Kline	Simmons
Cox	Knollenberg	Simpson
Cramer	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Crane	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Latham	Smith (TX)
Cubin	LaTourette	Souder
Cuberson	Leach	Stearns
Cunningham	Lee	Sullivan
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (CA)	Sweeney
Davis, Tom	Lewis (KY)	Tancredo
Deal (GA)	Linder	Tauzin
DeLay	LoBiondo	Taylor (MS)
DeMint	Lucas (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas (OK)	Terry
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Thomas
Doolittle	Marshall	Tiahrt
Dreier	Matheson	Tiberi
Duncan	McCotter	Toomey
Dunn	McCrery	Turner (OH)
Ehlers	McHugh	Upton
Emerson	McInnis	Vitter
English	McKeon	Walden (OR)
Everett	Mica	Walsh
Feeney	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Ferguson	Miller (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Flake	Miller, Gary	Weldon (PA)
Fletcher	Moran (KS)	Weller
Foley	Murphy	Whitfield
Forbes	Murtha	Wicker
Fossella	Musgrave	Wilson (NM)
Franks (AZ)	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt	Wolf
Gallegly	Ney	Young (AK)
Garrett (NJ)	Northup	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Buyer	Hyde	Thornberry
Gephardt	Lipinski	Udall (CO)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2305

Mr. BURGESS and Mr. SOUDER changed their vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOPES AND PRAYERS FOR STEVE BUYER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AND HIS FAMILY AS HE DEPARTS FOR MILITARY DUTY

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD a letter that I received today.

"Dear Mr. Speaker: I have been called to active duty in the United States Army. Pending further orders, I request immediate indefinite leave of the United States House of Representatives to accommodate my military duties.

"Respectfully, Steve Buyer, Member of Congress"

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the resolution we are considering affects one of our own today and may affect others in the near future. Our hopes and prayers are with STEVE and his family as he prepares to depart for Iraq.

OUR DUTY TO PROTECT AMERICA

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, we will be considering a very important resolution before us this evening. I rise in strong support of that resolution, and I expect that all of my colleagues would vote for it.

Our men and women in uniform are now engaged in an important conflict

in the country of Iraq. We are engaged with 30-some other nations, and it involves certainly a tyrant who has defined himself over the last 20 years.

Like my colleagues, I remember the day of September 11, 2001. I remember standing in the front of my office waiting to get a call from the Vice President and looking and watching an unfamiliar phenomenon, a roll of black smoke going across the mall that I can look down from my window and see. And I asked one of my staff, I said, find out; that black smoke is not supposed to be there. A minute and a half later they came in and said, well, the third plane had gone into the Pentagon.

Little bekownst to me and the rest of us at that time, there was a fourth plane involved, and 9 or 10 or 11 brave young men and women brought that plane down into an empty field in southern Pennsylvania. We know now that if it had not been for the actions of those people, that plane would have been in the west front of the Capitol.

That being said, many of us visited right after the World Trade Center. We had walked the halls of the Pentagon and visited those folks who helped pull their comrades out, some to safety, some beyond help. We talked to the families who lost their folks in the Pentagon, the World Trade Towers; we passed some extraordinary legislation.

But this country suffered a huge loss that day. I think I speak for all of us when I say that that is something that we do not want to see visited upon this Nation again. We know that in Iraq Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction. We know that he has a nexus to al Qaeda, and we know that that training has been going on over an extended period of time. I believe that it is our duty, this Nation's duty, to protect our Nation and to make sure that that is not visited upon this Nation ever again.

The men and women whom we are about to salute and wish well tonight and send our best thoughts and prayers to are doing a job that nobody wants to do. Nobody wishes this to have to happen. But in the tradition of this Nation, in the tradition of keeping this country free, and in the tradition of trying to stabilize the Middle East, we are doing this job. We are doing it with 30 other nations who have decided this is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, as we go through this very sober debate tonight, I would ask for your positive consideration and positive vote.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE STEVE BUYER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable STEVE BUYER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 20, 2003.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, H-232, The
Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have been called to active duty in the United States Army. Pending further orders, I request immediate indefinite leave of the House of Representatives to accommodate my military duties.

Respectfully,

STEVE BUYER,
Member of Congress

EXPRESSING SUPPORT AND APPRECIATION FOR THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES PARTICIPATING IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 104) expressing the support and appreciation of the Nation for the President and the members of the Armed Forces who are participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration pursuant to the following order:

Debate on the concurrent resolution shall be limited to 2 hours, equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption, without intervening motion or demand for a division of the question.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, has rightly reminded us tonight of the events of 9/11. I think all of us remember the time that we stood together singing "God bless America" on the steps of this Capitol, unified in recognizing that what is involved here is bigger than us as individuals or as political parties, and how we joined with near unanimity in supporting the President on the war on terrorism.

□ 2315

Thanks to the good efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), we did this once again about 10 days ago, when he offered his resolution, H.J. Res. 27, "commending the continuing dedication, selfless service, and commitment of members of the Armed Forces and their families during the Global War on Terrorism." At that time I rose, along with many colleagues, to support that resolution honoring our service members and to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for an effort that brought us together, rather than splitting us apart.

I doubt that we can offer too many resolutions for our servicemen and servicewomen, so I understand the gentleman's interest in offering a further

resolution tonight. I would like nothing more than to see a similar unanimous vote in support of that resolution.

I would ask the gentleman under my reservation, since we have not yet even had this resolution printed for our review, if he is familiar with a resolution commending our troops that was authored by Senators FRIST and WARNER and Senators DASCHLE and LEVIN, and which was passed unanimously today in the United States Senate?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman asking me if I am aware that the other body passed a resolution?

Mr. DOGGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Is it correct that the gentleman's resolution is not the same as resolution S. Con. Res. 26?

Mr. HUNTER. That is true.

Mr. DOGGETT. I believe the gentleman's resolution omits clause 5 of Senate resolution S. Con. Res. 26, which says that the Congress "joins all Americans in remembering those who lost their lives during Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm in 1991, and those still missing from that conflict, including Captain Scott Speicher of the United States Navy".

Would the gentleman be open to amending his resolution to include that language from clause 5 of the Senate Con. Res. 26?

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield further, yes, we would be open to including it.

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentleman would be open to including that language?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to add clause 5 of the Senate version, S. Con. Res. 26.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would retract that and tell the gentleman that I would not be open to that. Would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOGGETT. Let me just ask, and then I will be very brief, because I know it is late and the gentleman wishes to proceed.

The Senate, I am sure, acted, and not every word did I agree with, but they did act unanimously. It was good enough for the majority leader, Senator FRIST and Senator WARNER, chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Could we not dispense with this debate and simply take up, with the gentleman's approval, the entire Senate resolution and adopt it, and have every one of us saying not only the same thing in this House chamber but saying the same thing throughout the Capitol, that with one voice, we, the House and Senate, approve and applaud and support our troops?

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I just want to advise the gentleman that I read not only the resolution that was offered by the other body in 1991, but

also our resolution. We had a different resolution at that point, also.

I would just say to the gentleman that I think that the Members of this body have made a very fine statement, a very heartfelt statement commending our troops. I think it says the right thing. I applaud the gentleman for other things that he would like to see in a resolution. I think reasonable minds can differ.

I would hope that the gentleman would, in the spirit of bipartisan support for people that wear the uniform of the United States, not ask us to have precisely the same words as the other body, and simply spend a few minutes and go home. I would hope the gentleman would allow us to have our own resolution to express our own heartfelt support for those people, and let this body work its will.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I respect the gentleman. Continuing under my reservation very briefly, it just seems to me we have heard so much about the need for us to speak with one voice that we could speak with one voice and do it promptly by taking verbatim what was good enough for Senators FRIST and WARNER.

But let me ask the gentleman one other question, since he talks about acting with unanimity. The gentleman has three enacting clauses in his resolution. Clause two commends the Members of the United States Armed Forces; Clause three commends their families. I think there is unanimous agreement for both of these.

Would the gentleman be open under his unanimous consent agreement to our proceeding now by unanimous consent to approve those two clauses, so that we could concentrate our debate in the only area that we have any difference, which are the words that the gentleman uses to approve the President's action with his first-strike policy in clause one?

Mr. HUNTER. No.

Mr. DOGGETT. Just one final question. The draft of this resolution, and I know there have been changes going on all night, but the draft that we Democrats were asked to approve late this afternoon was a little like the President's recent budget on Afghanistan, which he forgot to fund. The resolution draft we were offered as praising the troops largely forgot the troops.

I was wondering if the gentleman would have any objection to my putting into the RECORD the resolution draft that we were given this afternoon and asked to approve, which did not include in the "whereas" clauses much of anything about our servicemembers other than the first and last paragraphs. Most all of it seems to be about the President.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman that we have some excellent commendations in this particular resolution.

Mr. DOGGETT. Added at our request, for the troops.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me finish my statement, if I might.

We commend the President as Commander in Chief. That is something we did in 1991. Under the Constitution, he leads this military force. We commend the Members of the United States Armed Forces. We commend the families. We give them our sincere gratitude and appreciation.

I would think that any Member reading this resolution, and I would ask all Members to read it since the gentleman has called it into question, would agree that this resolution is an excellent resolution, and that it does all the things that we want to do. It would lead us all to wonder why the gentleman somehow wants it to say something else or follow some other example. It does not make a lot of sense.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I will save the rest of my remarks for the debate.

Mr. HUNTER. I will look forward to that.

Mr. DOGGETT. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, this type of unanimous consent request, which seeks only to place in the RECORD the draft of the resolution we Democrats were asked to concur in this afternoon, that it might be made part of the record so all could see it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. THOMAS. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized under his reservation of objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, as any Member, has the right to place any material under extension of remarks in another area of parliamentary procedure of this body. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman makes clear why the Chair should entertain only one unanimous consent request at a time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has the right to place in the RECORD at another point in the proceedings. Since he has that right, which cannot be removed, I object to doing it at this time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it being apparent that the decision of 99 Members of the United States Senate is inadequate for some in this House, that they will not accept even placing in the RECORD at this point, at a very appropriate and proper point, the resolution they offered us, which treated the troops almost as an afterthought, since the goal was not to applaud the troops but the President; and recognizing their refusal to let us approve now unanimously what we all agreed to, that the Members of the Armed Forces and their families deserve commendation, even if we disagree with the civilian, political decision to institute a

new first-strike policy, which will actually endanger our families, I recognize little ability to reach unanimity; and I will raise the rest of my concerns about the Administration's unfortunate new policy, which places so many in harm's way, in the course of the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) may be heard under his reservation.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), we are all patriots and we all want to support the troops, including our colleague. We all want to support their families.

In hopes of trying to come to an agreement here, I am wondering if the gentleman would be willing to modify his unanimous consent request to include a more neutral resolution which supports the troops, as we all do, for their valiant and dedicated work, consistently performing in a professional manner; and which supports the families at this time of difficulty and trial?

Since I think unanimously there is a way that we can all agree on this, would the gentleman be prepared to support House Concurrent Resolution 105, which I left at the desk and which is at the desk there, which is a resolution that supports the troops, but does not require Members to agree with the policy in Iraq?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the gentleman and to the gentleman who just spoke, there are hundreds of thousands of Americans in uniform putting themselves in very difficult positions for our freedom tonight. If they are watching this procedure, they are probably wondering, what in the heck are those guys doing? We have a commending vehicle.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio controls the time.

Mr. HUNTER. I guess what I am saying is the answer is no to the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) controls the time.

Mr. KUCINICH. To the gentleman, and he is a gentleman, I would like to say that we all agree that we want to support the troops. This resolution, however, or at least half of it, is not about the troops. At least half of it is about the war in Iraq, which is a matter of contention. We understand that. There are 133 Members of this House who voted against the Iraq resolution.

The gentleman has made his decision, and I regret the decision, which I

think unfortunately politicizes what is really a very important resolution to support the troops. I think it lets politics get beyond the water's edge, Mr. Speaker. I do not think my good friend really intends to do that.

I have a question to ask my good friend. Mr. Speaker, in looking at this resolution, I would like to call attention to page 3 of the resolution. I just want to understand, would the gentleman be prepared to amend his unanimous consent request to eliminate any references in this resolution to 9-11, since no credible evidence has ever been presented that would link Iraq to 9-11, so that this Congress would not be put in a position when something really has not been decided, we have not had a commission that has made that decision?

The media has not really had an investigation that has decided that Iraq is connected to 9-11, this Congress has not made that association, yet this resolution does make that association. Would the gentleman be prepared to delete that reference in order to make this resolution something that would be more palatable?

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, first, that restates the President's letter.

Second, a second point I would make to the gentleman is that we have been working, Democrats and Republicans, to put this resolution together. My colleague, the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, has been working on it. The gentleman's leadership has been working on it. The product that we have before us is a product of both sides.

I would just say to the gentleman if he has a disagreement with it and he thinks that it does not state his position, I would urge the gentleman to take time in this debate in the next several hours and explain his position; but nonetheless, let the rest of us in this House work our will and give our commendation to the troops. Obviously, we would all write it differently.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is correct. I think this House should be able to give a commendation to the troops.

Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my reservation of objection in the hopes that in the course of the debate we can clarify that while we all support the troops, there are many of us who have reservations about the wording of this resolution and it going beyond support for the troops.

Mr. HUNTER. I look forward to the gentleman's statement.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

□ 2330

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear the gentleman from California respond to the gentleman from Ohio when the gentleman from Ohio referred to that part

of the resolution which quotes the President's letter and said he disagreed with it in effect.

The response from the gentleman from California was that simply factually recounts the President's letter. If, in fact, he is saying this is not necessarily by this body an endorsement of that, but simply a recognition of the fact that the President says it, and this is on the record, I think that would help us advance this.

So I appreciate the gentleman from California having made that point that that particular phrase that the gentleman from Ohio mentioned is not the wording of this House. It is a reference to a fact that the President said that, and it does not reflect one way or the other what individual Members might think.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be so considered.

There was no objection.

The text of H. Con. Res. 104 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 104

Whereas the United States Armed Forces, a total force comprised of active, National Guard, and Reserve personnel, are now undertaking courageous and determined operations against the forces of Saddam Hussein's regime;

Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives and the American people have the greatest pride in the members of the Armed Forces and strongly support them;

Whereas the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-338) stated that it should be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq and to promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime;

Whereas on October 16, 2002, the President signed into law House Joint Resolution 114 of the 107th Congress, the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243), which provides congressional authorization for the use of military force against Iraq;

Whereas the United Nations Security Council, in Security Council Resolution 1441, adopted on November 8, 2002, voted unanimously that Iraq "...will face serious consequences as a result of its continued violations of its obligations" to disarm in accordance with all relevant United Nations resolutions;

Whereas Iraq remains in material breach of the relevant United Nations resolutions;

Whereas the United States has assembled and deployed an allied military coalition to apply pressure on Saddam Hussein to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions;

Whereas on March 18, 2003, the President transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate the President's determination, consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243), that reliance by the United States on further diplomatic and other peaceful means alone will neither adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq nor likely lead to enforcement of all relevant United Na-

tions Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq, and that the President's use of military force against Iraq is consistent with necessary ongoing efforts by the United States and other countries against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations, or persons who planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001;

Whereas on the evening of March 17, 2003, the President of the United States issued Saddam Hussein and his sons a final ultimatum to leave Iraq within 48 hours or face United States military intervention;

Whereas, when Saddam Hussein failed to comply, the President ordered United States Armed Forces to commence military operations against the forces of Saddam Hussein during the evening of March 19, 2003, under the code name of Operation Iraqi Freedom, in order to liberate Iraq, remove Saddam Hussein from power, and neutralize Iraq's weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas the United States Armed Forces and allied forces are performing their missions with great courage and distinction in carrying out air, land, and sea attacks against Iraqi military targets; and

Whereas the ability of the Armed Forces to successfully perform their mission requires the support of their nation, community, and families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress expresses the unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation—

(1) to the President as Commander-in-Chief for his firm leadership and decisive action in the conduct of military operations in Iraq as part of the on-going Global War on Terrorism;

(2) to the members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are carrying out their missions with excellence, patriotism, and bravery; and

(3) to the families of the United States military personnel serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are providing support and prayers for their loved ones currently engaged in military operations in Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 60 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I rise today, this country is embarked on a very noble endeavor. Last evening, military forces of the United States and our coalition allies commenced military operations to liberate the country of Iraq.

This is indeed a historic moment. Operation Iraqi Freedom marks the culmination of nearly 13 years of U.S. action in Iraq. Commencing with Iraq's invasion of Kuwait on August 2, 1990, through Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, through the coalition enforcement of the northern and southern no-fly zones, to Operation Desert Fox and beyond, the United States and our allies have for over a decade been required to deal with the deceit, brutality and duplicity of Saddam Hussein, both diplomatically and militarily.

Today Saddam's moment of truth has arrived. The path to his downfall began

when the Congress passed and President Clinton signed the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998, making it the policy of this Nation to support efforts to remove Saddam's regime from power and to promote a democratic government in Iraq. It continued last fall when Congress passed and President Bush signed House Joint Resolution 114 authorizing the use of military force in Iraq should it become necessary.

Since the passage of that resolution, President Bush has undertaken herculean efforts to avoid a conflict. The President aggressively pursued the unanimous passage of U.N. Security Council Resolution 1441, calling for Iraq to disarm or face grave consequences. Subsequently, the President has exhausted every diplomatic means available to make the United Nations Security Council enforce 1441 to no avail.

Today, the time for diplomacy has passed.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today does three things. First, it expresses the support and appreciation of our Nation to the President for his firm leadership and decisive action in the conduct of the military operations currently underway in Iraq. It is because of his wisdom and judgment that Iraq will soon be a free Nation, a Nation without weapons of mass destruction, a Nation that will become a full and peaceful participant in the international community.

Second, this resolution expresses the support and appreciation of a Nation to our men and women in uniform. A few short weeks ago, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and I brought forward H.J. Res. 27 commending the members of our Armed Forces and their families for the dedication to duty and service to country that they demonstrate each and every day around the world. Today we bring forward this resolution to show our support, admiration and thanks for the nearly 230,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines and coast guardsmen who are participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Because of their dedication and devotion to duty, Operation Iraqi Freedom will be a success.

Finally, this resolution expresses support for the families who wait at home for their loved ones who have undertaken this mission. Without the love and support of the families, our military personnel could not focus on the serious task at hand in Iraq, and I want to express a special thanks to the families of those serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Their sacrifice will not be in vain.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to show our support for our men and women in uniform by supporting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a solemn moment for this body. We are here this evening rep-

resenting Americans all across our land, and we are here to say on their behalf thank you to the young men and women who wear the uniform today, just as those veterans have done in yesteryear.

I appreciate the Speaker mentioning to this body that our colleague and friend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) has been called to Active Duty. We will remember him in our thoughts and prayers, just like we do every soldier, sailor, airman and marine who represents us in this struggle for freedom and the end of a regime that could cause great harm to the free world.

It is too bad that we have to have a resolution for our young men and women when they are in danger. Maybe we ought to pass one when there is a time for peace, when there is no conflict or a threat of conflict. It was the British poet Rudyard Kipling that put it so well in his poem "Tommy" when he said, It's Tommy this and Tommy that and throw them out the brute, but savior of his country when the guns begin to shoot.

I think we should show respect and thanks and appreciation to those who wear the uniform, who are trained daily, working daily, and, when they are called upon as they are now, be ready.

So I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), my good friend and chairman, for his efforts. We have worked so well, as we did on a previous resolution just a few days ago, and sadly, the process by which we find ourselves here tonight has not met with full understanding. Nevertheless, we are here to commend those troops for what they are about to do and what they are doing on the field of battle this evening.

We unite as Americans in support of our troops, who are the truest expression of what this country stands for: courage, strength, compassion. They are the finest sons, daughters we have to offer the world as defenders of freedom, both in the United States of America, for the Iraqi people, as well as for those who love freedom across this globe.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. We will have a number of speakers, and as a result thereof, I will cut my remarks short, and I thank the gentleman from California for his efforts in this behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to respond to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and all the members of our Committee on Armed Services, Republican and Democrat, who work every day to support the people in uniform who are protecting American freedom around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this great instrument of freedom, our Armed Forces, have saved the world and liberated hundreds of

millions of people in three major conflicts, World War I, World War II and, of course, the Cold War that involved several smaller wars, smaller battles, that I call Vietnam and Korea, and we have liberated hundreds of millions of people.

The real product of our Army and our Navy and our Marine Corps and our Air Force is freedom, and shortly we are going to be liberating 23 million more people, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in that great book about Korea, it was called the Bridges of Toko-Ri, by James Michener, if my colleagues have read that book, watched that movie, they may recall that the hero was a carrier pilot, flew out and hit a set of bridges in Toko-Ri that they had gone after day after day and lost a lot of people, and in the end that pilot did not come back. The commander of that carrier air group stood on the deck of the carrier when it was clear he would not return and neither would those people who were sent out to rescue him, and he asked, where does America get these people who will join the U.S. Armed Forces and put themselves in a very dangerous position, in this case go off on a mission, fly into enemy territory, hit a very heavily defended target and come back and try to find that little postage stamp called an American aircraft carrier? Then he answered his own question: They come from the cities and the towns and the villages of this country, and they always have, and as long as they continue to come, we are going to be a free Nation.

Mr. Speaker, one of those people comes from Shelbyville, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who was the top gun in Vietnam, nominated for the Congressional Medal of Honor, and a guy whose heart always travels with people that wear the uniform of the United States.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have thought a lot about this resolution. I do not think any of us can speak adequately on our feelings to our men and women that serve us today. They are today not only in Iraq, but in Afghanistan and all over this world, and they go a long way to protect our families and our country.

Over 40 nations have joined the leadership of the United States, and they also send their sons and their daughters and their family members so that terrorism will stay there instead of here.

My friends, like the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), they know the fears of Private Ryan and We Were Soldiers and Glory, and I guarantee my colleagues the families do, too.

My mom cried when I was shot down. An officer told her that I had been shot down, and she passed out, and they took her to the hospital before she even knew that I was okay. In my district and in my colleagues' districts, I

bet them, there are children right now weeping for their parents.

This is an important resolution. I hate to see the partisanship, that things come up. I know different people believe certain ways, but let us not do it here. This is so important.

I know when we were overseas, many of us, it was important. I did not care if it was President Johnson, I did not care if it was President Clinton, all I wanted to know was that the Congress was behind us, that they would support us and that the Congress would support our leaders because they had to make the decisions that kept us alive or not.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding time and for his distinguished service on the committee and to our country, and I also commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

In the previous day, a couple of weeks ago, we had a very fine resolution on the floor that they proposed that was worthy of the troops that we were honoring. I wish we had that resolution before us today.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution which, in part, honors our courageous men and women in uniform. I disagree with the policy that took us to this war. I dispute some of the arguments used in favor of this resolution, and I am disappointed in some of the provisions in it, but even those objections cannot overcome the pride and appreciation that I have in our troops and the message that I want them to hear from us tonight of our support for them.

Tonight the thoughts and prayers of all Americans are with our military forces and their families. I think we should be honoring the military wherever they serve in our country tonight because they are all brave, courageous, patriotic and willing to make the sacrifice for our country.

□ 2345

Mr. Speaker, I certainly think we could have done better in this resolution, but do not let that stand in Members' way for us to give a resounding vote of support of appreciation and pride for our men and women in uniform.

Tonight we learned of the first casualties of this war. Sixteen American and British Marines have died in a tragic helicopter accident in Kuwait. I hope it is a comfort to the families who lost their loved ones that so many people mourn their loss and are praying for them at this sad time. There is no heavier burden for a President and no more solemn choice for this Nation than to send our young men and women into battle.

As Commander in Chief, President Bush has made that difficult decision. Despite our policy decisions, as Americans we stand behind our men and

women in uniform. As Congress, charged by the U.S. Constitution with providing for the common defense, we pledge today to our Armed Forces and their families, they will have the support they need in this dangerous and difficult time, both to win the war and to secure the peace.

In recent weeks I have met with some of these courageous men and women. We have all been meeting with them over time; but as the war drew near, it was more poignant. I traveled with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, to Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri to meet with the B-2 crews that may soon be engaged over Iraq. They were again brave and patriotic. Everyone respected the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), as Members can imagine; and everyone recognized what a great patriot he is in our country.

Three weeks ago, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), I traveled to Kuwait, Qatar, and Turkey to meet with the soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines now risking their lives in Iraq. We brought with us Members' good wishes of appreciation and pride, and thanked them for their patriotism, courage and, willingness to make the ultimate sacrifice.

Our men and women in uniform are an inspiration. They have waved goodbye to their husbands, wives, and children; and they endure daily hardships over many months to enhance America's diplomatic leverage. They are focused on their mission, motivated by a profound love of country and prepared, yes, to make the ultimate sacrifice. They are the best-trained, best-equipped and best-led military force the world has ever seen; and every American is eternally indebted to these patriots.

During our visit to the Persian Gulf, we met a young soldier named Captain Jennifer Schulke of Fort Bliss, Texas. She commands a Patriot missile battery in Kuwait. With the precision and ease of an engineer, she described for us the capability of the weapons system she commands. But she spoke with even greater pride of something else, about her daughter back home. Her daughter will be 2 years old on March 27, and on her birthday her mother will be serving in a country halfway around the world. Captain Schulke is one of the countless mothers and fathers, husband and wives and sons and daughters in uniform making sacrifices American families can only begin to imagine. I thought of her today when we heard of the Scud attacks and the Patriot response. It is people like Captain Schulke who inspire us and insist that we must support our men and women in uniform.

Today we pray for their swift and safe return into the loving arms of their families. When they come home, we will honor them for the heroes they are. And if they do not come home, we

will support their families and honor their heroic deeds. We also honor our men and women in uniform by proving ourselves worthy of their sacrifice when we uphold the democratic values they defend with their very lives.

As we protect and defend the American people, we must also protect and defend the Constitution and the civil liberties contained therein which we cherish. And we must treat honest debate for what it is, an expression of patriotism, not a violation of it. Open discussion of the great task before us does not give comfort to America's adversaries. No, on the contrary, it gives comfort and confidence to the American people who look to Congress to uphold the immutable values and ideals that define our American democracy.

Today, America's sons and daughters preparing to go into Iraq have answered the call of their country. In the days to come, let us build a future worthy of their sacrifice. May God bless our courageous forces and their brave families. May God bless America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Even though the hour is late, Members are willing to stay here because it is so important for the House of Representatives to express our support for our men and women in uniform, our troops in harm's way now, and as the minority leader said, those troops anywhere in the world and at home. And also to support their families for the sacrifices that they are making. It is tough on the families, probably tougher on the families than any other people. We are also here to commend the President for his strong leadership in bringing us to where we are today.

Our men and women in uniform need to understand why they are fighting and why they are risking their lives, and understand that this House supports them in that because in order to risk their lives, they have to understand that they are doing it for the right reasons.

Last night began a challenging time for our country as our Armed Forces went on the march against tyranny. It also signaled the time for our country to come together with singleness of purpose and speak with a single voice.

Under our Constitution, America speaks through the United States Congress, and last year we spoke out boldly and strongly from both political parties. We let the world know that the defenders of freedom are not going to allow the world's leading purveyor and practitioner of terror continue to spread his grip of fear.

Today, Congress is set to speak again for the American people. We want to honor the men and women of our Armed Forces who are conducting their mission with the utmost honor and courage as they defend our democracy.

We salute every person taking risks to confront terrorism and tyranny to expand the frontiers of freedom, and we salute the President for showing the world the power of strong, moral leadership.

We know that Saddam Hussein is seeking the means to murder millions in just a single moment, and he is consumed with hatred for America. We know that the war on terrorism will be fought here at home unless we summon the will to confront evil before it attacks. Free democratic nations must be willing to stop his evil aspirations. He is not a man with whom we can confer, consult, or convince. He is not a man we can trust. He has violated 17 United Nations resolutions. He is in material breach of multiple U.N. resolutions, and he has ignored the final ultimatum by the President of the United States.

Saddam Hussein once agreed to end his missile program. He agreed to stop building chemical weapons. He agreed to stop developing biological weapons. He agreed to end his nuclear weapons program. He agreed to stop brutalizing and oppressing his people. He agreed to do many, many other things; but every promise he made was a lie. Every agreement was a devious swindle. Every commitment was an expedient falsehood.

It was all a devilish strategy designed to escape accountability for past crimes and to buy the time to develop weapons for even greater crimes against humanity.

He turned the regime's resources to the awful purpose of developing terror weapons to spread the cruelty and oppression beyond his own borders. He welcomes terrorists to sanctuary and support within his own borders.

During the years that Saddam Hussein slow-walked the United Nations through his series of deceptions, his regime systematically brutalized the Iraqi people. He tortures children to punish their parents. He executes members of his government to enforce obedience. We can never know how many faceless victims have screamed out their last words to the uncaring ears of Saddam Hussein's torturers.

As a member of England's Labour Party recently laid out in chilling detail earlier this week, Saddam Hussein is a diabolical prodigy in the craft of evil. This member spoke of Iraqi citizens who witnessed men being forced into a machine intended to shred plastic. The men who went in head first were, in a tragic sense, the fortunate ones. The men who were sent to their death feet first, their final words were anguished screams for mercy. She told of women raped as Saddam Hussein's torturers made their husbands watch.

This is wickedness that by the grace of God the people of America will never know. We have not cornered the market on morality, but our policy of intervention to force an end to this evil is clearly a just cause, a worthy war and a principled stand.

Fortunately, President Bush is proceeding with courage and boldness. He is leading with moral clarity. He is fighting principled battles, and he is not backing down. We have to give President Bush our full support as he confronts this evil, and our men and women in uniform as they confront this evil.

This vote to support our Commander in Chief and our courageous troops in battle sends the right message that we are denying Saddam Hussein the power to take additional lives. We believe that in the teeth of terrorism, America must continue exporting the values, democratic institutions, and patterns of conduct that have built the strongest and fairest system of government and the most free society the world has ever seen.

We feel very deeply for all of the people trapped within autocratic regimes and born with repressive governments. And as defenders of freedom, we also owe the besieged people of Iraq the same hope we supplied to the people of Germany nearly 6 decades ago.

In the battle between freedom and terrorist tyranny, there is no middle ground. We look to the day, far off though it may be, when every person comes into this world with the full promise of their God-given rights upheld by the government of their birthplace. This is a bold vision and a noble goal, but the potential of the American people is not constrained by the timid boundaries of conventional thinking. We are called to far more than that. And due to the excellence and patriotism and bravery of our soldiers and their families, and the courage of the President with moral purpose, the liberation of Iraq has begun.

May God bless our President, may God bless our troops, may God bless our Nation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the war to remove the grave threat posed by Saddam Hussein and his regime's weapons of mass destruction has begun. Throughout this mission, the men and women of our Armed Forces will have the unwavering support of Congress and the American people. I thank the leadership of both parties for bringing this important resolution to the floor.

Today, this House speaks with one clear voice to America's allies and adversaries alike. We stand united in strong support of our troops.

My wife, Army Major General Kathy Frost, Commander of the Army Air Force Exchange Service, recently visited our troops in four Persian Gulf countries. She has shared with me their absolute commitment to everything asked of them by our country to complete this mission.

I also wish to recognize the thousands of American civilians, such as

the AAFES employees, who are providing vital support to our troops in the Persian Gulf. The work of these civilians is essential to the success of this mission, and they, too, deserve our gratitude for taking the enormous risk to work in what is now a combat zone.

□ 0000

Our troops will succeed in carrying out this mission. Like all Americans, I hope and pray they do so as safely and quickly as possible.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), chairman of the appropriations Subcommittee on Defense and a guy who works every day on behalf of folks in uniform.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise really to express my deep appreciation for both the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for the fabulous job they do on behalf of the men and women who make up our Armed Forces. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and I have talked about the fact that I am very proud at this moment in our history to have the privilege to chair the subcommittee of appropriations that does the funding for the men and women who are now serving us overseas.

This evening we will have before us a budget that is probably the finest budget in terms of national security that I have seen in all the years I have been in Congress, and we will have the opportunity in that budget to express our strong support for those men and women who are doing this work on our behalf and on behalf of freedom in the Middle East this evening.

But particularly relative to this resolution are these two gentlemen, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), who have come together to provide a vehicle for us to express our deep appreciation, our deepest appreciation, for the work that they are about. Indeed, it is America's challenge to preserve freedom and provide leadership for freedom in the world. The men and women who are serving us this evening who we are praising by way of this resolution are right at the point of the strength of America as we go out carrying forward that responsibility we have to be the world's force for peace as well as for freedom. I thank them so much for what they are doing.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the concurrent resolution. We are now at a state of war with Iraq. Regardless of how we as individuals

may feel about the President's decision to go to war, it is imperative that we support the men and women who are in Iraq now and who have put their lives in harm's way.

Over the last few months, we as a nation have engaged in a vigorous discussion concerning our policy toward Iraq. During this time, many people have expressed a differing view from the President's concerning Iraq.

No one should ever mistake our open society for weakness of spirit and resolve. I support our American and allied troops, and I pray for a swift and decisive conclusion with as few casualties as possible.

When the fighting concludes, and if Iraqi President Saddam Hussein and his top officials survive the war, I have introduced a resolution with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON, which calls for the establishment of a U.N. war crimes tribunal to investigate and try them for crimes against humanity, genocide and other criminal violations of international law. I have little doubt that such a tribunal is justified. There is an enormous amount of irrefutable evidence that Saddam and his top officials ordered Iraqi soldiers to commit atrocities against their own population and against others, including American soldiers during the 1991 Gulf War.

Our immediate focus after the fighting stops must be to stabilize Iraq and the entire Middle East region. After the war the United States and our international partners must help Iraq transition to a democratic republic that respects the rule of law and human rights. I also look forward to working with the President to ensure that Iraq has the help it needs to transition to a democratic republic that respects the rule of law and human rights.

The weeks ahead will be difficult ones, but I know Americans will join me in supporting our troops who are in harm's way. I also know that all of us want a swift conclusion to this conflict with as little loss of life as possible.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, we all wanted diplomacy to find a peaceful solution, and now we all want our troops home as quickly and safely as possible. The enemy should understand that it can take no comfort in the disagreement we have had with President Bush on the wisdom of a unilateral war in Iraq. Once our President sends our men and women into harm's way, we will do everything possible to support our troops abroad and their families here at home.

I share the sadness and concern for our fighting men and women and the people of Iraq. I join my colleagues and Californians in wanting to ensure our troops are safe, innocent civilians casualties are avoided, Saddam is disarmed, and the world community is engaged in rebuilding a democratic Iraq.

When I was in the Persian Gulf earlier this year, I saw many of the men and women who will win this war for America. They are young, they are smart, and they are ready. To the men and women of the Armed Forces, especially those from Travis Air Force Base and Reserve and National Guard units from throughout California and the Bay area, you have the unwavering

support of this Congress and the American people. To the families of these brave men and women, let me tell you that your sacrifice is tremendous, and we are praying for your loved ones' safe return.

Now the only exit strategy that remains is victory. I am confident that day will come soon. God bless our troops and God bless America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Projection Forces.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, however much we may disagree in the Congress and the country about how we got to this moment in time, here we are. Americans are engaged in battle to disarm Saddam Hussein of his weapons of mass destruction and to free the Iraqi people from his reign of terror. The world must know all Americans stand behind President George W. Bush in his role as Commander in Chief. The world must also know that all Americans stand united in support of our magnificent military personnel who are now in harm's way. Victory is certain. I believe it is important that we all pray and ask for God's guidance and assistance that victory come swiftly and with as little loss of life as possible, both American and Iraqi.

I believe the surest path to peace is through strength. Americans are a peaceful people, but evil exists. This is a time when the evil of Saddam Hussein and the threat he poses must be defeated with military force. It is right and proper that we appeal to God, for we need His help to move beyond war and achieve the goal of a free and prosperous Iraq that will be a model for the Middle East and the world.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1999, the now majority leader addressed the House of Representatives with these solemn words:

"Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult speech for me to give because I normally, and I still do, support our military and the fine work that they are doing. But I cannot support a failed foreign policy." I quote this, Mr. Speaker, not in criticism and not for any political purpose, but because these words express my feelings to-night, just as they expressed the majority leader's when our troops were in Kosovo, a policy I supported, just as he supports the war in Iraq.

Each and every word of praise and support for our troops in this resolution I wholeheartedly endorse. As a mother, every expression of gratitude and prayer for their families I embrace. But as one who believes that this pre-emptive war that put these brave patriots in harm's way is unwise and unnecessary, I cannot in good conscience support a resolution that unequivocally endorses that action. I deeply

love my country, and without reservation the men and women who wear our uniform, but regretfully, will not be able to support this resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as a parent of three sons who are in the military, I rise in support of the resolution being offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

In particular, I had the opportunity just last month of going on a delegation to visit our troops in Kuwait. It was an extraordinary opportunity. The delegation was led by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS). We went to encourage the troops, but actually while I was there, they encouraged me. We saw the troops of the 82nd Airborne, the 3rd Infantry Division, neighbors of mine from Fort Stewart, Georgia; I was able to see the troops from the 1st Marine Division.

At each stop we were encouraged by the high morale of the troops. We could see that they had the best equipment in the world. They have the best training in the world. They have the finest military leaders in the world. My greatest concern for the troops was the threat of chemical and biological weapons.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities. Yesterday we had a presentation which revealed to us the extraordinary technology which is being provided our troops, the lightweight protective gear, the wonderful modern gas masks, the 20,000 chemical detection devices. Each one of our troops is well protected against chemical and biological weapons.

We have 44 allies involved in the coalition that is facing Saddam Hussein at this time. In the Persian Gulf there were 41. Two countries in particular I want to thank. I have had the opportunity to be with Ambassador Elena Poptodorova of Bulgaria. Bulgaria has provided troops. It is providing the first American air base in the history of their country at Burgas. I also thank Ambassador Sorin Ducaru of Romania. I met with him 2 days ago. It is just extraordinary the services they are providing as they support the war against terrorism and the war against Saddam Hussein.

I conclude, God bless our troops.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, the United States is at war. We have one Armed Forces, one Commander in Chief, one Nation. There are questions to be asked about how we came to this moment, about the diplomacy, about the relationships with our allies, about the shifting rationales we have been offered for war. These are serious issues.

They should and will be debated here by historians and scholars in the months and years ahead.

Today is not a time for that debate. There are hundreds and thousands of young men and women in harm's way, my neighbors and yours. Our attention should be focused on those young men and women, the success of their mission, and their safe return.

I had the fortunate experience of serving in the White House. I know firsthand what a solitary and difficult decision it is for a President to send our Armed Forces into harm's way. I well remember some Members of this body, in the midst of conflict, attacking the President, the Commander in Chief, even as he worked day and night to complete a mission to bring our servicemen and women home safely. It was wrong then. It would be wrong now.

I for one will not do that to our President, to our Commander in Chief. I want him to succeed. We should all want him to succeed. So long as our troops are engaged, we should suspend the debate over how and why, focus on the mission, unite as a country in prayer and resolve, hope for a speedy resolution of this war, with a minimum of loss. God bless America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

(Mr. WAMP asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word to the courageous men and women in uniform and a word to the courageous men and women of the United States Congress. First, I think we should remember September 11 because the greatest generation on whose shoulders we stand today were incredibly encouraged by the bravery and the sacrifice following September 11 when we were struck in our homeland. They were encouraged because they realized that their children and grandchildren had what it takes, that we were actually willing to answer our call to courage in our generation, and that we were willing to sacrifice.

Today's men and women in uniform around the world are standing in the gap between a threat and our civilian population, and we all thank them for that.

When I was growing up, it was almost all Active Duty career men and women in the military. Today it is the Guard and the Reserves, and they are all deployed, and they leave their jobs and they go and they serve, and they did not know this moment was going to come, but they are ready and willing.

I sent off the 181st earlier this week from Chattanooga, Tennessee, and wives and parents were all there. They have got guts, and we appreciate them so very much.

But let me say something quickly to this body. I have been around long enough to know, I do not know what the next election is going to bring ex-

cept probably a real close election, and I do not know who is going to be President. I was raised in the Cold War, but I am raising my children in a hot war. This is not the only time that we are going to be on the floor addressing problems like this. We are going to be back. I do not know who is going to be President, but I hope that the tradition of us meeting at the water's edge when it comes to our national security is carried on, because this institution and that tradition is bigger than either party or any Member, and we must continue to stand together for freedom in the United States Congress.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of our troops and our families.

Mr. Speaker, at this moment my prayers and thoughts are with the service men and women who are braving the fierceness of battle in the deserts of Iraq. My best wishes are with them and their families for a safe return home. I have no doubt that they will be victorious in their undertaking and perform their duties honorably and bravely.

I have a particularly soft spot in my heart for the service men and women serving in Michigan's National Guard and reserve units that are now activated to duty. They are providing a myriad of services and tasks on behalf of the war effort and in service to our nation.

The politics of war should stop when the first shot is fired and when the men and women who make up our armed forces move into the field of battle. Some Members in this chamber have taken exception to the Administration's handling of the Iraq crisis, and I include myself among those who have had strong reservations about our road to war. If this were a simple resolution expressing our support and best wishes for the safe return of our troops, it would have my complete and unquestioning support. As a Member of the House Appropriations Committee, I will do everything I can to make sure that our troops are provided with the equipment and resources necessary to ensure their safety and support their families.

But I have strong reservations about the course of action that took us into our present state of war. My position on this war has been plainly clear since the beginning, when the Administration first proposed using preemptive action against Iraq. I supported working through the United Nations and our allies and using all diplomatic means possible to disarm Saddam Hussein. I do not feel that the President stayed true to this path and exhausted all diplomatic means available. Therefore, I could not in good, moral conscious, vote "yes" for this resolution because it represents an affirmation of the policy of pre-emption. I strongly disagree with the application of a pre-emptive doctrine. It is counter to our values as a democratic nation and our American tradition.

Now that we are committed, our troops are bound to perform their mission effectively and destroy the Iraqi war machine. As they pursue their objective, they will encounter many perils

as the war follows its course. I share with the President the wish that their job will be completed swiftly so that they will soon be returning home to their loved ones.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise with a heavy heart in strong support of our troops. My thoughts and prayers are with them, and I pray for their safe return. As a soldier's daughter, my heart also goes out to their families. I know they anxiously await their return home.

America's Armed Forces put their lives on the line and their sacrifices should never be forgotten. That is why just 2 weeks ago I voted in favor of H.J. Res. 27, which recognized and commended the continuing dedication and selfless service of members of the Armed Forces and their families. In spite of our policy differences, I do support our young men and women in uniform.

□ 0015

But what I cannot support, though, is this resolution that endorses war against Iraq. I believed and still believe that diplomatic alternatives existed, the inspections process was working. Keeping our troops out of harm's way has been and remains first and foremost on my mind and in my heart. May God protect them and return them safely home.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), who was a fighter pilot in the Persian Gulf and in Vietnam.

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to the many voices who are commending the troops of our Nation and our allies as they undertake the task of liberating the people of Iraq and removing the danger that Iraq's illegal weapons present to the world. It is unfortunate that Saddam Hussein did not take the opportunity given to him for the past 12 years to simply comply with the demands of the world and peacefully disarm. However, the decision to ignore the world will ultimately be a tragedy, mostly for Saddam Hussein.

Over the next few days we are going to find out just how fortunate we are to have our young men and women on the front lines. The bravery of our troops has already been demonstrated in the last 24 hours. A courageous 117 pilots have struck deep into Iraq with minimal support in some of the first air strikes of this war. Marines and soldiers alike in Kuwait have engaged the enemy in Iraq, and freedom for Iraq is closer today than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, in many ways this is the beginning of the end for many different people. For the Iraqi people, it is

the beginning of the end of 20 years of oppression and tyranny; and for terrorists another haven for training and planning attacks is coming to an end. For the men and women of our Armed Forces, 12 years of constant deployment to contain a tyrant is coming to an end.

The men and women of our Armed Forces will demonstrate to the world the courage of our Nation, and they will show that the United States will not tolerate appeasement that keeps tyrants in power and endangers the entire world. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

May God bless our leaders. May God bless our troops, and may God bless this great Nation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as we gather tonight, hundreds of thousands of Americans and allied troops are risking their safety to protect ours. They are courageously confronting Saddam Hussein and the danger his regime poses to the world, and we have the utmost confidence that their victory will be sure and swift. I pledge my full support to these brave men and women and my firm commitment to providing whatever resources may be necessary to back their critical mission. Just as importantly, I want to thank the loved ones these soldiers have left at home for their sacrifice during these difficult times.

Sadly, the deaths tonight of 16 Marines and British troops in a helicopter crash in Kuwait remind us of the great and constant risk our servicemen and women are facing. I offer my deepest condolences to their families in their time of grief. Above all, I express the gratitude of every American for the brave patriots who have been called upon to defend freedom and security.

May God be with each and every one of our troops as we all pray for their protection in combat and a quick and safe return home.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for his great service to the Committee on Armed Services.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK), another gentleman with great military expertise.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, as the representative of the Navy's Atlantic fleet and nearly 100,000 active duty servicemen and women, I am pleased to rise to honor our brave men and women in uniform. The piers in Norfolk stand empty tonight and thousands of families are risking their loved ones, but we pray along with them that their loved ones have a successful and safe mission

and that they can return home as soon as their mission is complete.

Fortunately, our enemies do not often witness the strength of the U.S. military firsthand, but Saddam Hussein's regime is learning of that strength tonight. It is the men and women of our armed services that give us that strength. Their resolute training, their unwaivering bravery, and their steeled resolve will bring a quick and decisive end to this conflict. These men and women have volunteered to fight and put their lives at risk to ensure our freedom and to liberate those held back by the chains of tyranny. These men and women represent the best that America has to offer, and we must stand united behind them and our Nation's leadership.

I thank the gentleman from California, whose son is an active duty Marine Corps officer and the gentleman from Missouri whose son is an active duty naval officer for bringing this resolution to us, and I urge its swift passage.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a Member of this body who was privileged to serve my country as an officer in the United States Navy. In that roll as chief psychiatrist at the Long Beach Naval Station at the height of the Vietnam War, it was my duty to evaluate and treat seaman and Marines returning from combat. I saw their pain.

I wish it to be clearly understood that I have the utmost respect and appreciation for the courage, tenacity, and dedication of those currently serving in Iraq and elsewhere. But, Mr. Speaker, war is not a partisan matter. The leadership should be ashamed of bringing this resolution to the floor. Everyone here wants to support an honest and straightforward resolution to support our troops. Do not give us a disingenuous and deceptive resolution that confuses the issue by asking us to endorse the Bush doctrine that sent our troops to war. I for one will not be forced to praise the President's reckless decisions when what I want to do is praise the troops. I cannot endorse the administration's policy of unilateral military action without international sanctions. This war of choice undermines the international order and endangers our Republic.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member. I appreciate this opportunity, and I rise really for two specific reasons. First, on behalf of those I represent in the Sixth Congressional District of Georgia, I want to rise to express my appreciation and my support for this resolution, the men and women whom it honors, the parents who raised them, and the Commander in Chief who today leads them.

And, secondly, I rise to pay tribute in memory of my best friend, Captain Jackson Elliot Cox, who died in 1967 in Vietnam. He died at a time when America's Congress was divided over another conflict at another time. He died and gave the last full measure of his life on behalf of this country so this body could do its work just as those men and women are doing today in the sands of Iraq and in the Middle East.

So before at this early stage we divide ourselves over words, I hope we will unite ourselves over the praise of these young men, these young women, their families that raised them, and the President that leads them. This resolution is important to all in America, but it is most important to those who tonight serve us while we have the freedom to debate, to vote, and to participate in the greatest democracy in the history of the world, the United States of America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, what a great opportunity we had tonight for all of us to unequivocally endorse and praise those brave young men and women who are prepared at any time to put their lives on the line and put themselves in harm's way for the interests of the United States of America.

My training in the military dictated to me that when that flag goes up, we salute it. When you are in the military, you do not have the options of determining which is a right war, which is a moral war, and which is any other type of war that one likes or dislikes. You do what you are told, and you fight for this great country.

As Members of Congress, however, we had an opportunity to forge a resolution that would not have any doubt about our unequivocal support for our men and women not just tonight but as long as we are able to serve in this great body for this great country. But somehow we sought not to do this. Somehow, as the majority leader said on different occasions, we wanted to mix policy with praise. Our fighting men and women do not have an opportunity to deal with policy; and yet this is what we are asked to do, as the majority leader said, that we must congratulate and express the unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation for a President who brought us where we are today. I do not like where we are today. I did not vote or support how we got where we are today. I am prepared to salute the Commander in Chief because he is in charge today, but why do you put me in the position that it even looks as though I am not supporting our men and women? Because I reserve the right as a Member of this body to disagree with this President or any other President as long as I am elected to serve my constituents.

I am happy that I will have other occasions to show in a more vocal way

my unequivocal support for our brave fighting men and women.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), a gentleman with great experience in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of this resolution to commend our troops and to show our complete support for them. The men and women engaged in the struggle against the war on terrorism face a difficult challenge, and we have seen it tonight with the loss of 16 servicemen. Whether directly involved in combat or serving in support roles, these brave individuals are responsible for providing protection to our allies and freedom to the people of Iraq.

There are those who may have debated the United States's role in this conflict, and fairly so. But now is a time to rise above this debate and send one clear message to the men and women of our Armed Forces. These troops need to know that we support what they are doing. If we express doubt as to the validity and purpose and importance of what they are doing, I am afraid our support will sound hollow to their ears. Our message to these troops is one of gratitude for what they have done and what they will continue to do to advance the cause of peace and protect our national security. Our prayer tonight is one for fortitude that they can persevere throughout the battle and return safely to their families and their loved ones.

We commend our troops for their service, and we pray for their safety.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, Abdul Henderson was called up as a Marine Reserve to go to Iraq. I am hoping and praying that he was not aboard that helicopter. As soon as I leave these Chambers, I will make a call out to Los Angeles.

He is the son of one of my employees. We saw him off. I support and I honor our troops for they are following commands, and I think the most honorable thing we can do is take them out of harm's way.

□ 0030

There is no way I can support this resolution because it speaks to a war that I feel is unnecessary and unjustifiable.

Even after we succeed in Iraq, is America going to be any safer? Because I remember the President talking about the Axis of Evil, Iran and North Korea. So I pray every day for our troops and their families. And let us do the right thing. Never, ever again should America do a preemptive strike. Why do we not do what we need to do, and that is go after Osama bin Laden, who has been proven to be an effective terrorist.

Bring our men and women home, and let us honor them so they can come back to their families.

God bless America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, in early February, the Speaker asked five of us to travel to the Middle East, first stopping in Kurdistan, on into Uzbekistan. We attempted to get into Afghanistan, but, due to bad weather, we were unable to; and also on into Kuwait city.

The purpose of that trip was to deliver a message from the Congress of the United States about the support that we have for Enduring Freedom and for the operation that is going on that they are carrying out today.

On our visit to each of the stops, we had four ways of expressing our gratitude. One, we had banners, banners that had inscribed the words from the President's State of the Union Address, when he addressed the troops and said, you believe in America, and America believes in you. Those banners were signed by hundreds of people, not just Members of Congress, but people from across the country who visited here in Washington. Each of those banners was signed by the Commander in Chief.

Another way that we had of expressing the gratitude of the Congress was a video, a 10-minute video which began with the Speaker of the House delivering a message personally, the Commanding General of Fort Benning, Georgia, people from the PX, people from the streets, also the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), Vice President DICK CHENEY, and ending by a message from the Commander in Chief, President Bush.

The third way that we expressed our gratitude from the Congress was with a flag. We presented each stop, each unit that we visited, with a flag that had been previously flown over the Capitol of the United States.

Five of us were traveling; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) and myself. Never once did we identify ourselves at any stop as other than Members of Congress. We did not carry a label by party, just Members of Congress, to express our gratitude.

The fourth way was there in person, to personally deliver the message. We never heard one complaint, and we shook the hands of thousands of men and women in uniform. Not one complaint, but a lot of fine compliments to the Congress and to the Commander in Chief. Proud to serve both.

But to our surprise in Uzbekistan, as we were presenting these gifts and expressions of gratitude of the Congress, they had a gift for the Congress. They had a flag that they had flown over the air base, K-2 in Uzbekistan, a forward operation base for Enduring Freedom. But not only did they fly it over the base, they put it aboard a C-130 gunship and flew it over Afghanistan, because they wanted to express to us their gratitude for what we do as Congress and for our Commander in Chief.

Should we not be doing that today in the same fashion that the five of us traveled, as Members of Congress; not by party label, just Members of Congress, proud to be so, and proud of our soldiers and our airmen, our sailors, our marines, our Coast Guard.

God bless each and every one, and God bless our Commander in Chief.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), the ranking member of the new Select Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tonight American soldiers are crossing the deserts of Iraq to disarm Saddam Hussein. It is a mission that will present unknown dangers to our young men and women in uniform. They go not as conquerors, but as liberators. They seek no sovereignty over the Iraqi people, but seek to grant the opportunity for freedom and democracy to an oppressed people.

Their mission is to disarm Saddam Hussein in accordance with the mandate of the United Nations Resolution 1441. Some would say that the task of disarmament might be accomplished without force, but none would deny that the threat of the use of force is the only credible tool in dealing with a dictator who has for 12 years defied the requirements of the resolutions of the United Nations.

Our Nation vigorously sought to unite the world in this cause. Though some of our allies failed to face the reality of a brutal dictator who seeks to accumulate weapons of mass destruction, we are joined tonight by over 40 nations to confront this dictator who controls a nation that possesses the wealth to achieve his goals of military dominance.

The policy of containment and mutual deterrence that worked successfully in the 20th century is not a strategy for security against the threats of weapons of mass destruction in the 21st century.

We join together tonight in deep gratitude for the brave young men and women who courageously face the dangers of our mission. They join a long line of patriots who have given us the opportunity to live in peace and prosperity. May God bless and protect them, and may His hand guide them in the pursuit of the cause of freedom and justice for all.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, some Members of this United States Congress support President Bush's preemptive strike against Iraq. Some Members have done their elected and patriotic duty and raised questions about the President's diplomatic failure and inability to resolve this conflict peacefully. However, every Member of Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, strongly support our men and women in uniform.

Why, then, could our Republican Members not agree to a clean-cut, clearly worded resolution of support for our soldiers? The Republican leadership chose to politicize this moment in history with a politically worded resolution designed to trap the opposition into supporting a war that we do not support. They have cheapened this debate by trying to use this resolution to legitimize this war. This war is neither legitimate nor necessary.

No matter, our troops are in harm's way. We support our soldiers and their families and will do everything in our power to make sure our men and women in uniform are honored and respected as they bravely serve our country. And when they return home, my office and my staff are always available to our men and women in uniform, and we will work very hard for them.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, 50,000 marines and sailors who call San Diego home are officially at war, and I respect their courage and the skills they bring in defending our freedom. I have met with many of these families and with those who advocate on behalf of them, the ombudspersons who volunteer every day to ensure that parents and spouses and children get the support they need in times of peace and in times of war.

I supported the resolution 2 weeks ago, and I will support it again tonight, because my support overrides honest differences that I and many of my constituents have in the course that we have taken.

Jessica, whose fiance is a marine in the Gulf, sent in an article from San Diego today: "Nobody wants war, but the troops need our support. They have the toughest job. I get to sleep in my bed tonight."

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, oh, freedom; oh freedom. I pledge my unequivocal support for the Armed Forces of the United States of America. I, too, have visited troops in Germany, Italy, Kosovo, Qatar, Bahrain and Hawaii.

I have attended deployments of two units from the 11th Congressional District of Ohio. Their mothers and fathers asked me, why are we going to war, and why in Iraq? I could not answer their question, but I, too, gave them a flag, and asked them to bring it back to me safely.

Oh, freedom; oh, freedom. Freedom includes the right to have free speech. Thank God I am free to speak in opposition to this resolution.

Oh, freedom; oh, freedom. The young men and women of the Armed Forces, God bless you, God keep you, God surround you with his love. Oh, freedom; oh, freedom.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), who, as he brings his distinguished service to this House, also is the distinguished father of a son who is serving tonight as we have this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of this resolution; not because I like every single word that is in it, but the words that mean the most to me this evening are those that relate to and are connected to the treasures of our Nation, the sons and the daughters that are in harm's way this evening.

They are the sons, they are the daughters; they are fathers, they are mothers; they are grandsons, they are granddaughters; they are nephews, they are nieces; and they are really the beloved of our Nation.

I have raised questions about what would bring us to war. I stand in opposition to preemption, but tonight I do not believe is the night for that debate. We had it before; I think we will have it again.

Our troops who wear the flag on their uniform may very well, some of them, come home with a flag draped around their coffin. So, tonight I think our entire Nation genuflects and prays for every single one of them.

Let God watch over them and bring them home safely to the families who gave birth to them, to the families that love them, and to the families that had to bid farewell to them.

God bless them, and God help us.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad day. I weep for my country tonight. I am sorry, very sorry, that we have arrived at this point.

□ 0045

Tonight I think the world is a much more dangerous place for all humankind.

I want to make it clear that I support all of our young men and women who are in harm's way, and I pray and I pray for their safe return.

But tonight, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for peace. War is bloody and messy. It destroys the hopes, the dreams, and aspirations of a people. In all good conscience, I cannot and will not vote for a resolution that supports and endorses a failed policy that led us to war. War is never the answer. War is obsolete.

The struggle for peace is as old as the dawn of history and as fresh as the

morning dew. The struggle for peace is a struggle that lasts for more than 1 day, 1 week, 1 year, or more than a lifetime. But we must struggle.

Is it possible, is it too much to ask? Maybe it is possible for humankind to evolve to a much higher level and lay down the tools of hate, violence, and war. If we want to create a beloved community, a community that is at peace with itself, if that is our end, if that is our goal, then our way must be one of love, one of nonviolence, one of peace.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I ask God's blessing on our soldiers, and may God bless our little planet we call Earth.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Today Congress stands in support of our Commander in Chief and our men and women in uniform. Tonight I join with all Americans in sending my thoughts and prayers to the men and women of our Armed Forces and their families. These brave soldiers have been entrusted with the ultimate responsibility of defending our freedom, and for this they have our unconditional support.

Citizens of my State know all too well the sacrifices that are made in times like this. In my home State of Connecticut, 35 percent of all National Guard and Army reserve troops have already been deployed to not only Iraq, but throughout the world, the third highest amount of any State in the Union.

We do not know what the days ahead for us will bring, yet it is the sincerest hope of every American that this conflict will be finished quickly and successfully. We hope there will be minimum casualties to our military and to the people of Iraq, and we will continue to pray for the safe return of these men and women to their families and their loved ones.

This is a time for all Americans to join together, to let our troops know that we support them fully and completely, and that they are in our hearts.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member on the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, we gather here for a well-deserved tribute to our troops in the Middle East. Yet just before this, we were debating the President's budget which cruelly cut \$25 billion of veterans benefits, including disabled veterans. Is this how Republicans would honor those who have made great sacrifices in defense of our country? Is that how they would boost the morale of our current troops? Every major veterans organization has denounced these cuts as unconscionable, but now the pending business before us is a little bit different.

So I rise to reject these efforts to piggyback support for President Bush's dangerous policies on to a simple, but deserved, resolution supporting our troops. I trust the American people to see through this attempt to coerce endorsement of his "preventive war" doctrine.

I fully support our troops and offer my prayers for their safe return. I am an Army veteran myself; I care deeply about their well-being. And precisely for that reason, I cannot in good conscience vote for tonight's resolution, a carefully crafted document to force endorsement of President Bush's doctrine of preventive war, allowing him to attack countries whenever or wherever he chooses. I will not provide support for such a dangerous doctrine.

For years to come, it will unnecessarily put current and future members of our Armed Forces in harm's way, even when our national security is not really threatened.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush is about to unleash the dogs of war. He has set the clock ticking toward an unprecedented barrage of destruction dropped on a city of 6 million human beings. The barrage is oddly named the days of "shock and awe." All Americans who hold human life precious should watch the clock run down, not with "awe" but with fear and trembling. The sad truth is that we are lurching towards an unnecessary war that President Bush seems determined to launch.

Apparently, therefore, the brave young men and women of our Armed Forces are about to head into harm's way. We all offer them our support as they try to do their duty, and we send our prayers for their safe return. But we must also be faithful to our duty, a duty entrusted exclusively to the Congress by our Founding Fathers. That is the solemn duty to decide whether the United States should go to war.

The Constitution's framers emphatically entrusted that decision to the Congress alone. They were adamant that the Executive not play a role—although once war began the Executive is the Commander-in-Chief to implement that decision. The Framers were so intent on excluding the President that they rejected an offer to share the power to declare war between the Congress and the Executive.

I know that President Bush, and many of my colleagues believe that the Congress properly authorized war against Iraq last Fall, pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution. I respectfully disagree. We have not performed our duty yet. Last fall Congress enacted a resolution that generally authorized the president to fight terrorism and to seek enforcement of previous U.N. Resolutions on Iraq. But in reality, that resolution bucked the duty constitutionally conferred on Congress to the President. It let the President decide to choose when and where and against whom to start a war. In short, it dodged the decision and sought to delegate an authority that may not be delegated.

The administration's supporters argue that legal precedents allow the Congress to provide an authorization of war that is functionally equivalent to the now rarely-used formal Declaration of War. That entirely misses the point. It is not the format which is at issue; it is "who decides?"

It was clear, at that time, from the congressional debate, from Executive Branch statements, and from the resolution itself that the diplomatic route would be pursued first, by going through the U.N. Subsequently, in response to a broad national consensus, the U.S. spearheaded U.N. Security Council passage of Resolution 1441 that imposed a new inspection regime. In other words, it was clear last fall that the decision of whether to declare war was being put off for a later date.

In the months since then, it has become increasingly clear that the decision on going to war would turn on two crucial assessments. The first would be an assessment of the results of that inspection program.

The second assessment, and the ultimate judgment, would require weighing the implications of the inspection results and other information about what threat Iraq poses to the U.S. against the full costs—fiscal, diplomatic, casualties and increased terrorism—of going to war. Clearly these are not military judgments for a Commander-in-Chief. They are precisely the kind of complex national policy judgments that the Founding Fathers conferred on the Congress in matters of war and peace.

Yet in the present circumstances, the Congress has abdicated any role in that fateful decision. The entire world has been riveted on whether the American President would decide to declare war against Iraq. President Bush has brazenly told journalists and Members of Congress alike that it is his decision, and his decision alone. This is a perversion of the Constitution.

Even if one argues that Congress properly exercised its constitutional duties, and that the President thereby has all necessary authority to start a war the fundamental questions remain. "Why war?" "Why now?" And most importantly, "Will waging war in Iraq make us more secure or less secure?"

Bush's war would have disastrous consequences for every American. War is about devastation, destruction and death. The American people are not bloodthirsty. We want war only if our country is in imminent danger. Otherwise, a war's human and economic costs are too great. The human devastation of death, injury and destruction is obvious. In addition, it will rob us of resources urgently needed by America's working families and less fortunate.

Even in terms of national security, an all-out war will rob Americans of hundreds of billions of dollars needed for the first line of defense in homeland security, on which we have made far too little progress since the tragedy of 9/11. As the President repeats his unverified mantra of "threats to national security," cities across this land are laying off police, firemen, and emergency medical services teams—the so-called "first responders" to any new terrorist attack. They must do so because this Administration's "first response" to empty city treasuries across America has been one word: "Tough."

This is not merely a partisan spat, nor a Washington insiders' policy dispute. The citizens' crusade to stop an immoral war in Iraq has been nothing less than a noble struggle for our Nation's soul. Thus far, that struggle has not succeeded. But we will not give up. We must commit ourselves to stopping hostilities and re-weaving the torn fabric of international organizations with the same dedica-

tion and urgency with which we strove to stop segregation and the Vietnam war, and finally brought our Government to its senses.

President Bush repeatedly insists that for him "war is a last resort." But his actions reveal that war was really his first choice, all along. His attempts to make it politically palatable by badgering, bullying and bribing countries into a counterfeit coalition have been a mere fig leaf transparent to the entire world.

President Bush has failed to present compelling evidence that Iraq currently is a threat to our national security. One rationale after another has been disproved. The President, Vice President and Secretary of Defense have presented a kaleidoscope of ever-changing rationale as they tried to stay one jump ahead of "truth squads" exposing their disinformation—at the U.N., among skeptical Members of Congress and the media, and even in their own intelligence agencies.

Americans have readily borne the burden of war when attacked or actually threatened. But America cannot, in good conscience, start a war so costly in blood and treasure simply on the basis of circumstantial evidence and speculation that, sometime in the unspecified future, Iraq may present an actual threat to the U.S.

Bush's war against Iraq is:

A war that will devastate a country of 26 million and cause damage that will take years to undo;

A war that will see many American casualties, and that could fracture our fragile economy;

A war that will destabilize the Middle East;

A war that will swell the ranks of terrorist recruits;

A war that will weaken our fight against terrorism, at home and abroad, and that will cost billions of dollars desperately needed for programs in Detroit and other cities;

A war that will set a terrible precedent, in a world of growing numbers of nuclear states, for any country to launch a preventive war against opponents deemed a possible future threat; and

A war not really wanted by the American people, our military commanders or our allies.

Worst of all, it is a war that, as the CIA admits, will only make it more likely that Saddam would unleash whatever unconventional weapons he does have against our troops, Israel and our other allies. There is no evidence Saddam seeks to commit suicide. We deterred him from using weapons of mass destruction during Desert Storm. If he faces destruction, however, Saddam may well seek to play Sampson and pull down the Temple for lethal revenge.

Last weekend, several of the Nation's leading newspapers seemed to suddenly discover all of these grave costs of war in Iraq. Article after article reported with an air of sudden discovery that:

The war would drastically increase the likelihood of Saddam's using weapons of mass destruction;

That it would almost certainly escalate dramatically terrorist attacks against Americans;

That many U.S. military commanders feared it would undermine the real war against terrorism;

That their could be extensive casualties among innocent Iraqi civilians; and

That, even following a quick "military victory" against Saddam, we could be mired in

an Iraqi quicksand of tribal feuds and guerrilla warfare for years.

I took cold comfort from the irony of the media's belated "discoveries." It would have been far more useful to their readers if the media had discovered this costly side of the war ledger months earlier. Instead, like the Administration, most media coverage focused only on whether, absent other concerns, it was desirable to prevent Saddam's pursuit of armaments and remove his regime—as if there were no competing costs on the other side of the ledger to be carefully weighed in deciding whether war would be a net plus for America.

There is still time for President Bush to avoid starting the wrong war, in the wrong place, at the wrong time. There is still time—but precious little time—for the American people to speak out against a war that few of them support. If the war commences, there is time for it to be brought to a rapid end and a reversion to diplomatic efforts and enhanced inspections.

We should remember the warning of General Anthony Zinni. A distinguished Marine Commandant and head of U.S. Central Command, which guards the Middle East, Zinni reminded us that military commanders know the full horrors of war and hesitate to plunge ahead unless the national interest is clearly at stake. On the other hand, Zinni warned, those who have never worn a uniform or seen combat often are the quickest to beat the drums of war.

Those are harsh words. The administration will condemn whoever utters them as partisan and unpatriotic—just as the Johnson White House condemned King's questioning of Vietnam. The Bush team has already spread that slander, in order to stop erosion of support for the war as the public learns the truth. Are the military veterans and retired generals opposed to this war unpatriotic? Are families of those who were killed on 9/11 and who oppose this war partisan? That is outrageous.

I know many of my colleagues have in good faith been convinced that Iraq is a threat to us now. But they have been the target of a Niagara of propaganda, especially the Vice President's early insistence that Saddam was involved in 9/11 and that Saddam had nuclear weapons now—both of which claims have long been disavowed by our intelligence community. Many other assertions and premises used by the administration to "market their product," in the revealing phrase of the White House Chief of staff, have crumbled under close scrutiny.

I would ask my colleagues who support the war to reconsider their view in light of these facts:

Almost the entire world is strongly against this war; this includes the majority of the citizens of even those countries formally part of the "coalition";

Every major city in America has gone on record against this war;

The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, almost every major Protestant denomination, the American Labor movement and the NAACP are against this war;

Leading retired U.S. military commanders such as General Zinni, and General Schwarzkopf—in his original unvarnished views—have voiced opposition to this war;

Numerous active duty generals have told reporters off the record of their concerns about a war against Iraq; and

General Scowcroft, who was also President George Herbert Walker Bush's National Security Advisory is against this war.

And all of this opposition has arisen even before the war has started—an unprecedented phenomenon in human history. In view of these facts, I ask whether it is just possible that there is something amiss with the President's premises with his logic, and with his rejection of further effort to resolve the issues peacefully.

I urge my colleague to reflect on these powerful facts and join me in pressing President Bush to find another way—to follow the path of peace. As the Bible teaches, "Blessed are the Peacemakers."

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran I stand behind our troops, and I ask everyone to get together in the form of solidarity.

Mr. Speaker, several months ago, when we voted on the President's Iraq resolution, we all hoped war could be avoided, even though most of us believed deep down that it was a forgone conclusion. It was just a matter of when. Well, the day we all knew would come upon us. As we speak the U.S. Army 7th Cavalry has engaged the enemy inside Iraq.

This is a difficult dilemma. We hope and pray that Saddam does not have any weapons of mass destruction to use against our troops. My faith teaches me that only those who are without sin should cast the first stone in conflict. We have cast the stone, and we'll just have to wait and see what the effects will be.

However, Mr. Speaker, none of that is important anymore. The most important issue we face as any war begins is how we are going to support our brave men and women in uniform. No matter how we feel about the prospect of waging war at this time, we must stand solidly behind our troops. Hundreds of soldiers from my district have already deployed. Thousands more from the Inland Empire and across California are heading to the Persian Gulf region. Even more Californians are serving our Nation in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines all over the World. It saddens me to think that some of these men and women will not return home to their mothers and fathers, to their sons and daughters, to their husbands and wives.

We can support our troops by keeping the promises we have made to our veterans, and by providing them with the benefits and healthcare that they have earned through their services to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as I think about the lives that may be lost in the coming days and weeks, I ask myself one question. Could this situation have been avoided? Although I cannot answer this question with 100 percent certainty, I have always believed that there was a diplomatic solution to the Iraq crisis. I believed that when I voted for a resolution in October authorizing the President to use our armed forces in support of any U.N. resolution mandating the disarmament of Saddam Hussein. Mr. Speaker, I still believe that now. Unfortunately, the diplomatic window is closed. Diplomacy no longer seems to be an option.

But I want my colleagues to hear me when I say this. Now is not the time to debate mis-

guided or unsuccessful policies. Now is the time to come together and support our brave men and women in uniform. We must let them and their families know that we appreciate their sacrifice. Let us rally around our troops and show the world that our Nation stands united. I hope the unity that Members on both sides of the aisle are showing tonight sends a strong signal to our troops. We are thinking of you and praying for you.

Mr. Speaker, I do have one request. I ask my constituents, and every American, to light a candle and pray for our troops and pray for all the innocent victims of this war.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, at times of great stress, great patriots rise to the occasion. Tonight there are young Americans who are rising to the occasion as they traverse across the desert sands of Iraq, as they soar across the unfriendly skies of Iraq, as they serve on naval ships. Tonight their families have risen to the occasion, as they sadly note the empty place at the dinner table, the bedtime story not read to a young son or daughter, or as they stare at the photograph on the mantel piece and wish that he or she were at home with them.

I know that every Member who has spoken tonight is a great patriot. Every Member who has spoken on both sides loves their country. And I know that many feel a sincere sense of doubt about some of the words that are in tonight's resolution. I would implore every Member, though, to try to rise to the occasion and rise above the words and rise to a symbol of unity that says to every one of these young men and women that their interests are our prime interests. I would ask every Member to support this resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) for his great work on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST), who was a distinguished Marine rifleman in Vietnam.

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), my good friend, the two of them, for bringing this resolution to the floor.

We all remember the words of Thomas Jefferson: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

And we remember the words of Abraham Lincoln: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, let us work together to bind up the Nation's wounds."

And another century passing by, we remember Martin Luther King, Jr. and his dream that little children will not

be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.

This great Nation of ours has seen periods of great joy, wretched despair, and great sacrifice. And still, we come, children of democracy, again here tonight to find our place in history. Our young men and women, once again on the front lines of history, once again in anticipation of great joy, although for some there will be wretched despair because some will not come home, we give them our praise and support for the sacrifice that they are now enduring as they bear the greatest burden of preserving and restoring freedom during this present crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with a very familiar poem by a Canadian soldier during World War I who did not make it home:

"In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row by row
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

"We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields."

Those who lie in Flanders fields said,
"Take up our quarrel with the foe:
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields."

The Americans in the Middle East are bearing the burden of the present crisis, and we come here tonight to mix and to mingle and to speak and to have differences, but the unity of this Congress, the unity of this Nation will linger for decades to come.

I stand here tonight to support the resolution.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is sadly too late for truth to be the first casualty of this war, because we have already had brave people killed. But truth is taking a beating tonight.

We had the floor manager of this bill object to efforts to democratize the process and give Members more choice to make real votes in the name of letting the House work its will. He blocked unanimous consent requests that would have allowed amendments, that would have allowed separated votes, theoretically in the name of democracy. We had another gentleman from California come and say, "let us not make this partisan," in defense of a resolution that is very partisan, that is drafted in a way that will minimize, rather than maximize, the goal Members pretend to want to be in favor of.

We have had Members who savaged Bill Clinton during the war in Kosovo, now announcing their convergence to the doctrine that once the guns start, the President is untouchable. Why? To use the unanimous admiration felt in this House for our troops for political purposes.

The gentleman from California who is managing the bill asked before, he said, people will be watching and they will say to us on the Democratic side, what are you doing? I will tell them what we were trying to do. We were trying to stop the Republicans from taking the troops politically hostage to serve the President's political purposes. We were trying not to allow the support that is unanimously felt for the troops, the admiration for their courage, the sympathy for the plight that their families are in; we did not want that used to puff up support that does not exist for decisions made by the President.

Sadly, we failed, because the majority used its control of this body, and so Members were put in an unfortunate position. But let us be very clear. Had the majority wanted to do it, there would have been a unanimous vote in this House, every Member voting, in support of the troops. The resolution, those parts of it that support the troops would have been unanimous. Unfortunately, partisanship has resulted in what will be a diminution in the vote that is cast for the support for the troops.

□ 0100

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking leader for yielding time to me.

I stand with great pride and respect in support of this resolution. I support our brave and courageous troops. I support their mission and their Commander in Chief. It is very difficult for me to stand here and say I support the troops and not their mission, and not the Commander in Chief that sent them in harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, we did not ask for this war. It was brought to us unexpectedly, without warning, savagely, tragically by terrorist suicide bombers, terrorists who are desperately trying to get their hands on weapons of mass destruction. Biological and chemical weapons, biological and chemical weapons are being manufactured by the tens of thousands of tons by Saddam Hussein of Iraq. What other choice would we have?

The least this Congress can do on a night when we are losing our military men, with their lives on the line, is to stand here together, Democrat and Republican, and support this resolution, and send a proud message to our men and women in uniform that we are here to stand with them, and stand in the evil day, and stand.

God bless America, God bless our troops, and thank God that we have got these courageous men and women who are willing to put their lives on the line. It is with great pride that I stand here to support this very worthwhile and important resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Chair will remind all

Members that there is a rumbling of noise out in the aisles, and ask Members to keep their conversations down or remove them to the cloakroom.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

(Mr. PEARCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing this resolution to the body. I salute the comments of the gentleman just prior to me. I appreciate the observations.

The Second Congressional District of New Mexico is home to the Stealth fighters, the ones who launched the attacks last night. I know personally some of the men and women of that unit, and recognize and know personally some of the National Guard and Reserve troops who are called up. I recognize the sacrifices of their family.

In 1967, I won the lottery. As a result of winning the draft lottery, I went for 3½ years into Vietnam, from the period of 1971 to 1974. I watched personally as a political discussion devolved into disrespect and disregard for what our troops were doing there: the insults, the spitting on, the disrespect that was given to our troops that emanated from a political discussion.

I hope that political discussion does not take the same road now; for even today when I see those Vietnam veterans who were disregarded so much on their return, their simple greeting is, welcome home, brother; and it is done with tears in the eyes of people who faced death every day.

I served at that time without regard for who my Commander in Chief was as far as a politician, but instead, of the duty that I was called to perform. I think our young men and women today are doing the same thing. I respect the sacrifices that their families make; I respect the sacrifices that they themselves make. I ask that we keep them in our prayers.

I support the resolution, and I thank the gentleman for bringing it.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

For the sacrifices of our sons and daughters in uniform and that of their families, no mere resolution or series of resolutions suffices to express our gratitude.

Because the support for our troops is so very strong and the justification for the administration's reckless first-strike doctrine is so very weak, this resolution relies on the pride that all of us feel for our troops in order to carry this weak policy, this faulty and unworthy policy that is so faulty it cannot stand on its own merits, it has to be clumped with the sacrifices of the men and women who serve America tonight in the Persian Gulf.

Just as this administration has failed completely to provide the slightest

link between Saddam Hussein and 9-11, this resolution mistakenly links the invasion of Iraq to the war on terrorism. I support that war. I recognize that containment and disarmament may not end all wars, but they are clearly superior to the new first-strike policy that risks wars without end.

This resolution could have been the one the Senate adopted today by 99 votes. It was good enough for Majority Leader FRIST, it was good enough for JOHN WARNER, but it did not go to the extremes that our colleagues want.

We could have all accepted my request that we approve by unanimous consent support for our troops and families, but they did not have that in mind. They want this back-door approval. We will not be intimidated into silence. If we were to do that, we would be abandoning the very democracy we are pledged to serve and that they tonight defend.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago I helped welcome home 235,000 Army soldiers from my district who had fought in Desert Storm. I saw firsthand how much it meant to them, to those brave Americans, that our Nation respected their service to country; and that is why I join my colleagues tonight in strong support of this resolution.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that a majority of my colleagues in less than 1 hour after this vote will support a budget resolution that the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have called "callous and unconscionable" in its treatment of veterans.

Today's troops are tomorrow's veterans. They will watch our deeds even more than our words. So in the spirit of supporting our troops, I propose that we reduce this morning the proposed dividend tax cut by less than 10 percent so we do not have to cut veterans services by \$8 billion. Let us honor today's troops and tomorrow's veterans with our words and our deeds.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Members will hear me say nothing tonight other than that we have the bravest, the most valiant, the most courageous young men and women in the world standing for our freedom.

But what I will say, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a need to speak the truth. The first truth is that we have lost brave young men and women already, and my deepest sympathy and affection and love for those families. I know full well the burying of young men and women who served in the United States military. I sat at the funeral of one in

my constituency, and the family still mourns.

So I rise tonight to stand on the side of peace over war and life over death. I remind this Congress that we are best when we understand what freedom is all about. Democracy is more than words; it is practice. So I agree with Hubert Humphrey when he said, what we need are critical lovers of America, patriots who express their faith in their country by working to improve it.

I stand before the Members to say that I commend and express the gratitude of the Nation to all Members of the United States Armed Forces, whether on active duty, in the National Guard, or in the Reserves, and the civilian employees who support their efforts, as well as the men and women of civilian national security agencies who are participating in the military operations of the Persian Gulf region, for their professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery.

Mr. Speaker, I will stand undivided in commending the brave men and women tonight, but I will also go to my death for the right to stand to save lives. I would clearly remind those who feel we are dividing the caucus, the Nation, the world, to be reminded that my voice is hoarse but my spirit is not broken; for I remind Members of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who wished that he had been able to stand more than 30 years ago to be able to save the lives of 58,000 brave young men and women in the Vietnam War. There are Vietnam veterans, and some came home, thank God. But I would rather be able to say that I stand, as I said, for life over death.

I thank Members for democracy that allows variety. You will never hear me say an unkind word of the Commander in Chief. I stand undivided and in support of the troops of the United States of America.

First and foremost, whether our valiant men and women of the United States Military are away from home to fight a war, to protect a peace, or to enforce disarmament, they will have the full support of the U.S. Congress. We will take every possible step to ensure that they are protected from potential attacks and a difficult environment, that they have the support they need to do their jobs effectively and efficiently, and that we bring them home safely as soon as practicable. I cite my support by referring to Sen. Con. Res. 26.

The Congress: Commends and expresses the gratitude of the Nation to all members of the United States Armed Forces (whether on active duty, in the National Guard, or in the Reserves) and the civilian employees who support their efforts, as well as the men and women of civilian national security agencies who are participating in the military operations in the Persian Gulf region for their professional excellence, dedicated patriotism and exemplary bravery;

Commends and expresses the gratitude of the Nation to the family members of soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and civilians serving in operations against Iraq who have borne the burden of sacrifice and separation from their loved ones;

Expresses its deep condolences to the families of brave Americans who have lost their lives in this noble undertaking, over many years, against Iraq;

Joins all Americans in remembering those who lost their lives during Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm in 1991, those still missing from that conflict, including Captain Scott Speicher, USN, and the thousands of Americans who have lost their lives in terrorist attacks over the years, and in the Global War on Terrorism

I continue to cite my support by referring to H. Con. Res. 104.

Whereas the United States Armed Forces, a total force comprised of active, National Guard, and Reserve personnel, are now undertaking courageous and determined operations against the forces of Saddam Hussein's regime;

Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives and the American people have the greatest pride in the members of the Armed Forces and strongly support them;

Whereas the United States Armed Forces and allied forces are performing their missions with great courage;

Whereas the ability of the Armed Forces to successfully perform their mission requires the support of their nation, community, and families: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Congress expresses the unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation:

To the President as Commander-in-Chief for his firm leadership [in the] ongoing Global War on Terrorism; to the members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are carrying out their missions with excellence, patriotism, and bravery; and to the families of the United States military personnel serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are providing support and prayers for their loved ones currently engaged in military operations in Iraq.

When history is recorded as I stand on this floor tonight, my words will note that I stand undivided from the troops. I have nothing but the greatest honor, respect, and admiration for their courage and their unselfishness.

May God have mercy on their families, and bless them in this time of challenge. And may God give all of our troops the fortitude, strength, and resolve to get their jobs done and then to get back home to their loved ones.

And for those whom we will never see again, they will remain heroes . . . throughout time, never forgotten, Patriots until the end.

God bless them, and God Bless the United States of America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE), who has a son in the United States Navy.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, as I sat last night in front of the TV, I could not take my eyes off of the images that I was seeing because, as a mother, I was thinking of my son. The gentlemen know that a mother's love is different than a father's love.

As I sat there, I thought of my grandmother, who sent two young sons off to war. I thought of my uncle, who was missing in action for over 13 months; of how the family felt when they did not know whether he was dead or alive. I

thought of my brother-in-law, who served in Korea. I thought of him because that, as you know, is the forgotten war. I thought of my brother who served in Germany.

I thought of the heroes among us in this Chamber, the veterans that we love and we honor. I thought of when I first shook the hand of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON). When I found out why his hand was crippled, I thought of how I wanted to kiss his hand and honor him.

Tonight, with a mother's heart, I want to say, God bless each one of the young men and women who are serving us. God bless their families that have made the sacrifice. When we are away from our loved ones, we want to hold them; and we are holding them in our hearts.

Today I got an e-mail from John, and it touched me. Let me just share it with you:

"Hey, everyone, I just wanted to drop an e-mail to you to let you know I am doing great and that I am safe and sound. Here on the ship, the spirits are high. Everyone is going about their business like we do every day. Everyone here is united in the spirit of what we are doing. It gives us a sense of how important our job really is. All the late hours, all the things we put up with, are now justified.

"Just wanted to give you a quick update and thank you for your thoughts and your prayers."

Tonight my thoughts and prayers are with our Commander in Chief. I pray that the Lord would give him wisdom. I pray for the team that he has surrounded himself with. I pray for the families whose young people are serving.

I want to give a clear message to every one of those young men and young women: never again in this Nation should we tell anyone who is serving that we do not appreciate what they have done, because we appreciate every one of them. We love them and we hold them in our hearts tonight. God willing they will come home so we can hold them in our arms again.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, of the over 200,000 men and women who are in and around Iraq this evening, I want to just touch on one person who was highlighted today in the New York Times, Captain Cynthia Brito from Woodside, Queens, my hometown. She is the daughter of Ecuadoran immigrants Angel Brito, a limousine driver, and his wife Ines, a jewelry worker.

□ 0115

Captain Brito is a graduate from Fordham University in the Bronx, and she is serving as a dentist in the Army in the 561st Medical Company of V Corps.

Captain Brito represents the best of the men and women who are fighting on our behalf on the front lines. She is

the daughter of immigrants, a female officer in a male-dominated Army, and a dentist with medical training. We know that she will be on the front line.

So much this evening has been said about the war, and I do not think enough has been said about our young men and women troops fighting over there. These mostly young men and women like Captain Brito are the ones truly making the sacrifice for our country.

Men, women, white, African American, Latino, Asian, Christian, Jews and Muslims, they are all the faces of this country. Our prayers go out to each and every one of them this evening and to all their families, especially to Cynthia Brito, who makes all of us proud.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the troops, to our troops overseas and everywhere in the world, thank you. I thank them for their bravery, thank them for their courage, thank them for believing in this Nation, thank them for being willing to give their life for our freedom. We love them, we support them, and I am sure that is all 535 Members of Congress.

As I look at this resolution, to me it is like a contract, and if a person signs a contract, that means they agree with everything in the contract. I do not agree with the doctrine of preemptive strike. Therefore, as to page 4, line 4 through 7, I disagree, and therefore, I cannot sign on to this contract.

I really wanted to sign on to and vote for this resolution, and we had an opportunity to speak as one Congress, House-Senate alike, sending the same message. That is unity. What a great opportunity we had. What a great opportunity we missed.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I stand tonight in support of this resolution not because I agree with the decisions that have brought us to this moment, but because I love, honor and revere those brave young Americans who are fighting for us even as we sit in this Chamber at this late hour.

I am troubled tonight because I believe one way we honor our current troops fighting in Iraq and around the world is to honor those who have served before them, our veterans, veterans like my brother who turned 79 years old last week and who served our Nation in World War II.

Very soon the vast majority of us will vote for this resolution to honor our troops, as we should. I am troubled that soon thereafter many of my colleagues in this Chamber will cast another vote, a vote that will cut \$28 billion from veterans' benefits. I am puzzled that so many would salute the troops with one hand and vote to cut \$28 billion from veterans' benefits with the other hand.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes for this resolution and to vote no for the budget resolution.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, last October I thought that it was absolutely necessary to disarm Saddam Hussein. I still think so, but I thought then and I think now that Saddam could have been disarmed without resort to war. So I voted against the resolution giving the President complete authority to use military force at his sole discretion.

Now our country is at war and our young people in harm's way. I unequivocally support our troops in their valiant role, and I, therefore, support this resolution.

This resolution expresses support for our troops and for their families and for the President's leadership "in the conduct of military operations in Iraq," and only for his conduct of those military operations. It does not, as some have said, express support for the President's decision to resort to war or for the administration's diplomacy that has led us to war.

Our troops and their families deserve our support, and I will express my support for them by voting for this resolution.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with this war, but I will always support our brave men and women in uniform and their families. They must be treated with dignity and respect, both while the battles are being fought and when they come home.

This means that our soldiers have the best military equipment and protective gear and that their families are cared for while they are away. The children and spouses of our military must not be on welfare rolls, and they must not have to survive off of food stamps or live in substandard homes.

The families of reservists and the National Guard should not suffer economically while their loved ones are called up for Active Duty. The families of enlisted soldiers must have salaries adequate to lift them out of poverty, and the United States must fulfill its promises by providing all necessary care and promised benefits to our enlisted and Reserve military personnel as active members and as veterans.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here tonight to endorse this resolution, but I must say that this resolution has language like

many pieces of legislation that moves through the body of this Congress. There is language in it that I do not agree with, and I am glad that I am able to state that as an American, but I think it is important that we remember that boys and girls, I mean teenagers, I also mean mothers and fathers, I also mean sons and daughters, are getting sand in their teeth right now defending our country, and I think it is important we send a very strong message to not only their families, but to their loved ones that this Congress stands firmly behind them.

I respect the Members that are going to vote for the resolution. I respect the Members that are not going to vote for this resolution, and I commend their patriotism for standing up for what they believe in, but I think it is imperative that we remember that we must have resolutions that every Member of this Congress can vote for because we are all patriots, and we all believe in the American way, and it is important that American families understand that we are together and united always when it comes down to defending this country.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I rise in support of this resolution.

I do not necessarily agree with every word of the resolution, but how many times have all of us voted for bills and resolutions that we do not agree with 100 percent? We have to make a choice, and I choose to support our troops. That is clearly the thrust of this resolution, to support the brave men and women that do us all proud.

War is never easy. War should always be a last resort, and while we can question the policies of any administration, the men and women that go to preserve freedom for our great country, we owe them our deepest gratitude.

I think it is very fitting that the Congress show our brave men and women that we strongly support them and that we join hands regardless of how some of us may feel about policy.

I voted to give the President the authority, and I think that now is the time to stand behind our President, to stand behind our troops and to move forward with one voice. Support the resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I rise this morning to honor the men and women of our armed services by supporting the support the troops resolution.

I believe the time has come for Americans to put aside our differences

concerning Operation Iraqi Freedom and to stand together to show solidarity for the men and women in our Armed Forces. It is time for all Americans to show their support for the mothers and fathers, the sons and daughters and friends and loved ones who are serving our Nation and defending our freedom.

Our Nation, at the guidance of our President, is facing the inevitable action in Iraq. War is something that we would never dream of for our children to see or to hear. There comes a time, however, when we must unite together and show the enemy that we will stand up for our freedoms, freedoms that our forefathers fought for and won, and we will fight to ensure that the United States remains a beacon of hope and freedom that brightens the world.

One woman in my district, Judith Allen of Denton, Texas, has done her part. After saying good-bye to her son, Private Joseph Paul Terrace, who is part of the Army's 101st Airborne Division, Judith formed the Military Support Group of Denton, Texas. The group is open to families and friends with loved ones in the Armed Forces.

Judith's son answered the call to duty and said in a recent interview with the Denton Record Chronicle, "Nobody actually wants to go to war, but they want to do their job, and they want to keep people safe, and we realize how much a real threat things are these days."

In my home county of Denton, Texas, county Judge Mary Horn and her husband Jim have a son also named Jim who is now in an undisclosed region in the Gulf. Keith Self, a man who was in the Republican primary with me in our six-way primary last spring, we were opposed during the primary, but we became friends and have remained friends since that time, Lieutenant Colonel Self was recalled to Active Duty and now serves in an undisclosed location in the Gulf.

My own son Mike serves in the Air National Guard in Fort Worth, Texas. While he has not been called into Active Duty, part of his unit has and is now in an undisclosed location in the Gulf.

I do not believe that in our ordinary life we think about the sacrifices that our U.S. military personnel make, from the hardship of time away from families and children to the hundreds of reservists who unselfishly answer the call to duty. These men and women protect our borders, shield our skies, guard our country, believe in America and support our President. These brave souls will march the same steps of previous generations who gave of their lives to defend our homeland and to secure the blessings of liberty for our country and for generations to come.

While our troops and allies exemplify the true spirit of patriotism, we, the citizens at home, must remain united for freedom and show the world we believe in liberty more than the horror of allowing a deadly dictator to threaten the security of liberty.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), an Army veteran and distinguished Member of this body.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to come and stand before my colleagues this evening, and regardless of how we got here, I think the time has come that we ought to stand together for the troops, and so I appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for bringing this to the floor.

I have to reflect on some things, as many of us have done, veterans here, as many of us are, and the lack of support for the two times I went to Vietnam. I was reflecting on that this last Monday when I went to three different communities to activate troops, went off from Fort Riley and will go to the Middle East.

I looked at the faces of the men and women and the uniform, and I realized how much I appreciated when that gymnasium in these three different towns, three different locations, that was packed to the walls, the support of the families and the community was so meaningful and so special and so appreciated.

□ 0130

So I support the resolution, and I encourage Members to support it, to support our men and women in uniform. God bless America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member, for bringing this resolution to the floor to express our support for our citizen soldiers, all of our men and women who proudly wear the uniform of our armed services, as they are now in harm's way fighting the war against terror in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to debate the substance of the merits of the war, but only to express our support, especially for the families and loved ones who anxiously wait and wonder if their husbands, wives, brothers and sisters, mothers or fathers, aunts and uncles and friends will return from the war.

As a Vietnam veteran, nothing warms the hearts and minds of our soldiers, sailors, airmen or Marines more than to know that we here in this Chamber support and pray for their welfare, knowing that at any moment our men and women in the military walk a very thin line between life and death.

Mr. Speaker, the words of Martin Luther King, Jr., ring well in my ears tonight. He said, "In the end, we will not remember the words of our enemies, but the silence of our friends."

Mr. Speaker, God bless our men and women in the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Chairman of the Armed Services Committee (Mr. HUNTER) and our senior ranking member, Mr. SKELTON, for bringing this resolution to the floor, to express our fullest support for our citizens-soldiers—all our men and women who proudly wear the uniforms of our armed services, as they are now in harm's way fighting the war in Iraq.

I am not here to debate the substance or the merits of the war, but only to express our support especially for the families and loved ones who anxiously wait and wonder if their husbands and wives, fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters, uncles and aunts and friends will return from the war.

As a Vietnam veteran, Mr. Speaker, nothing warms the hearts and minds of our soldiers, our sailors, our marines and our airmen more than to know that we here in this Chamber support and pray for their welfare—knowing that any moment our men and women in the military walk a very thin line between life and death.

Mr. Speaker, the words of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. rings well in my ears tonight. He said, "In the end, we will not remember the words of our enemies, but the silence of our friends."

Mr. Speaker, as the most powerful military power in the world, we need to also be reminded of a statement made centuries ago by Thucydides who said, "Of all manifestations of power, restraint impresses most men."

Mr. Speaker, God bless our men and women in the armed forces.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing we all agree upon, we are grateful to our troops and their families. We respect the men and women in our Armed Forces, and we admire their patriotism and bravery. We all recognize that no matter what the policy disagreements about the steps that took us to this day of invasion, our troops are doing their duty and putting their bodies on the line for our country. They are in our prayers, and we all hope for a speedy conclusion and a safe return for each of them.

How fine it would have been if the right-wingers in charge of this House had put aside their partisanship for just this evening and agreed to write a clean resolution that supported our troops; but no. One can always count on them to try to wedge an issue, divide people and make partisan what should be purely American.

There are plenty of things in this resolution that are just not true, but I am going to vote for it because of clause 2 and 3. I do support and appreciate our Armed Forces and their families. I cannot say the same thing about the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and the rest of the Republican leaders who once again have proven by their actions this evening that they are more interested in partisan advantage for their party than unity and success for our country. They dishonor our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines who

are the real patriots we seek to honor by this resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just say to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services, that I would hope that the gentleman would discourage Members like the Member who just spoke from using this time when we are supposed to be commending our troops from demeaning other Members of this House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I had this and I was not going to use it. I am on the same side as the gentleman. I am in the minority of my party on this issue. But I want to tell Members that they cannot have it both ways. On December 13, 1995, our troops were deployed. Our troops were deployed in Bosnia. They were deployed for the purposes of keeping the peace. They were successful. Thousands of people were being killed. The gentleman remembers that, and our troops were deployed for the purpose of keeping the peace pursuant to an agreement by President Clinton and others in the NATO alliance.

There was a resolution on the floor. That resolution was a very brief resolution and it had one resolved clause, just one and it said this: That the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) voted "no" on that resolution. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) voted "no" on that resolution. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), who spoke earlier, voted "no" on that resolution. The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who talked about the troops, voted "no" on that resolution.

I am with my friend on the substance, but when the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) gets up and makes her statement and she is criticized, remember December 13, 1995.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), a distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for yielding me this time.

To the point on Bosnia, a lot of us had misgivings. I remember going there fully intent on finding kids to tell me it was a bad idea. I met a kid from Ocean Springs, Mississippi. I regret that I cannot remember his first name. His last name is Rhodes. I asked

him should we be here. It was a couple of weeks before Thanksgiving. It was snowing and crummy. It is 80 degrees in Ocean Springs, and it is 18 degrees in Bosnia.

And the kid said, Yeah. I was dumbfounded. I said, Why? He said because I am keeping women from getting raped. I am keeping children from getting murdered. I am keeping old folks from getting drug out into the street and getting tortured at night. That is why I joined the United States Army, to be a good guy.

Tonight we vote to commend the 250,000 young Americans, just like Private Rhodes, who are doing the very same thing.

To my colleagues, I would say every other generation of Americans, check the record, every other generation of Americans voted to pay the cost of those wars right then and not stick the young Private Rhodeses with that bill. Let us not be the first generation of Americans that after we welcome the Private Rhodeses home, stick them with the bill from this war.

I am going to vote for the resolution because it is exactly right, but I am going to vote against their budget because they are sticking those 250,000 young Americans and their children with this bill. That is inexcusable. Let us vote for the troops. Let us vote to pay the bill. Those of us fortunate enough not to be on the front lines, not to watch our buddies lose an arm or leg, their vision, not to watch our buddies die, at least ought to be willing to pay the bill for this war right now and not stick our kids with it.

In the past 2 years, we have run up \$802 billion worth of debt. That is no prize to hand those kids when they come home. Let us support the troops and pay for this war right now. Let us be honest with the American people and leave them a Nation that is worthy of their sacrifice.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Chair reminds all Members to turn off their electronic devices.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Robert Kennedy once remarked, "All of us, from the wealthiest and most powerful men, to the weakest and hungriest children, share one precious possession, the name American."

So tonight as our brave men and women in uniform fight for freedom and our security half a world away, we come here not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans, Americans united as one in support of our Armed Forces, and for the success of the cause for which they willingly risk their lives.

That cause, liberty and freedom from fear, inspired our Founding Fathers 227 years ago, and guides our action today. It is a measure of our Nation's greatness that when freedom's call came at

this hour, the finest, best-trained, most skilled and best-equipped military in the history of the world answered the call as previous generations have done.

Our thoughts and prayers are with our troops and with the troops of our allies, four of whom also lost their lives this night, and our thoughts as well are with the families who wait. We are with you. We honor you; we honor your sacrifice. We hail your courage, and we pray for your safe return.

We are confident that the Iraqi people who have been terrorized for so long under Saddam Hussein's brutal reign will soon throw off the shackles of tyranny and see that your mission has always been one of liberation and not of aggression. There should be no doubt we shall win this war, and we must win the peace that will follow. We are committed to a liberated and free Iraq where individual Iraqis can decide their own fate, where basic human rights and the rule of law are respected, and where that nation's tremendous resources are the property of a proud Iraqi people, and not plundered by an international criminal who has killed his own people and who continues to threaten the security of the region and the world.

Saddam Hussein believed, like other dictators and despots who pockmark history, that our democratic debate was evidence of disunity and weakness. He was wrong.

In fact, as all of us who are privileged to serve here know, that ability to debate, that ability to disagree, that ability to want options is what makes America so strong, so envied.

Tonight we stand as one behind our brave Armed Forces. No matter the votes, we stand as one and pray for a quick end to this conflict and to the safe return of our brave men and women and the brave men and women of every nation who will fight in those sands.

May God protect our men and women. May God give wisdom to our Commander in Chief, and may God continue to bless America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS).

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of the resolution honoring our troops, their families and our President. It is time that we unite in this recognition and recognize the sacrifice that all pay for our freedom.

I am reminded of two boyhood friends who served in Vietnam, but did not return, Emery Manor Smith, a fine young man, a good friend and a great neighbor. Also I am reminded of another friend, Joe Berry, another great friend and neighbor. I am reminded of a nephew who served in the first Gulf War, Scott Baker, and I honor him tonight for his service to America. I have a neighbor, Adam Ivy, who currently serves in the Gulf as a United States Marine. He serves proudly to protect America from a dictator who would inflict enormous pain and suffering, and to free the people of Iraq.

□ 0145

Tonight we need to unite as one in support of our troops, in support of their families and in support of our President. I believe, and I am sure you agree, we live in the greatest Nation in the world. It is time that we honor those who protect our freedom. May God bless America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of our troops, but on principle must vote against the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my heartfelt support for our men and women who are currently engaged in war with Iraq. Although I disagree with this war, and the policies that have brought us to this point—our troops deserve the full support of America. The more than 200,000 courageous men and women in Iraq represent the best of America. They have made the ultimate sacrifice to serve their country and protect and defend freedom.

The troops are ordinary men and women who are doing extraordinary things. Many of our service people have left family behind to fulfill their commitment to serve. The men and women of our armed services epitomize the biblical proverb: "No greater love is there than one who would lay down his/her life for their fellow man."

I want to assure the families of our service men and women that I stand fully behind them. In addition, I will do everything that I can to ensure that they have the best equipment and resources necessary to carry out their mission and provide for their safe return.

While I have no doubt that America will prevail militarily. It is my hope and expectation that we will redouble our efforts to seek collective, nonmilitary solutions to these critical issues. Also, as we engage in war I hope that we take every effort to minimize collateral damage to civilians and innocent people.

Again, I want to commend and honor the outstanding men and women of our armed services who are carrying out their orders with great distinction.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution and stand 1,000 percent behind our brave and selfless men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

At this decisive moment in history, all Americans stand 1000 percent behind our brave and selfless men and women in uniform.

I have no doubt America will achieve a military victory in Iraq. The road after that will be long, and require sustained commitment along with the support of our allies.

No one can predict fully the course of world events as this war begins, so we must draw our strength from one another. This is a time for reflection, and kindness to one another.

I extend deepest respect to all the people of our community country who have open discussed and not shirked from their responsibilities as free citizens in addressing how best to defeat rising terrorism around the world. Your voices will shape a wiser course for the future.

May the God that creates and sustains us all protect the world's children for a general of peace to come.

Mr. SKELTON. May I inquire of the Chair how many minutes we have remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I mentioned earlier in the evening, this is a solemn moment. I wish I had the eloquence of diction to sway everyone within hearing distance to vote for this resolution. However, in my mind it is one that speaks loudly and clearly about the young men and young women who wear the uniform today, many of whom will be in harm's way very soon. They are all not Active Duty. We have 212,000 National Guard and reservists called up; 26,000 are in the Gulf area. Our hearts and thoughts are with them.

Earlier in the evening the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) quoted that famous poem that came out of the First World War, Flanders Fields. Part of that poem reads:

To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields.

Every generation, it seems, has thrown the torch of freedom to hold it high. The generation today that stands guard for Americans wherever they may be, fighting terrorists or in the Gulf, are the ones that are holding that torch high today. We salute them and thank them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone in this body to support this resolution. I give a special thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman, a veteran of the Army, the Vietnam conflict, for his courtesy and help in putting this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ).

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to address the House tonight, especially this night. I suspicion that many of us came here because, as we would put it, we love this Nation. We love America. As I sit here and listened to this debate on this resolution tonight, it also crossed my mind that this is a resolution about that very thing, about loving America.

Let me tell my colleagues a story about what loving America really is. I have some childhood friends back home in Colorado, Karen and Leon Palmer. I

went to grade school and high school with them. They dated. They got married. They had but one son. His name is Matthew. Matthew got an appointment and has graduated from the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs and is now a pilot in the United States Air Force. In fact, he may be one of the brave pilots that engaged Saddam Hussein just last evening.

When I came back here to be sworn in for my very first time in Congress, this 108th Congress, Matthew's mother Karen came by my house and she gave me a picture of Matthew inside the cockpit of his F-16. She could tell that this action that has now been joined might be coming. She looked at me and she said, "Bob, please take care of Matthew. Keep him safe. Keep him well equipped. I would love to have him come home, but," she said, and this is what love is, "more than that, I love this Nation, and I love the ideals of this Nation, and I love what this Nation is willing to protect. If I have to sacrifice my only son for the sake of this Nation and for the sake of liberty, Leon and I are prepared to do that."

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater love than that.

There has been enough partisanship in this body tonight. We ought to check our partisanship at the doors of this great Chamber and vote in support of this resolution about love and about freedom and support our troops.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I offer my prayers, heartfelt sentiments and unwavering support to our American soldiers who are facing enemy fire in a faraway land. I also offer my prayers and my support to their families who eagerly await their safe return. However, I do not support the dastardly attempt by my Republican colleagues to demean our love and concern for our soldiers by shamelessly attempting to transfix our focus from them onto the narrow-minded and misguided policies of their Commander in Chief.

Mr. Speaker, Scripture says in the book of Proverbs 29:2, "When the righteous rule, the people rejoice. But when a wicked man rules, the people groan." Thousands of my fellow Americans are on the streets this night, on the streets of this Nation, protesting this unjust war. They groan because they do not understand and I do not understand why we are at war.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully cannot support this resolution as written.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. One of the age-old realities of politics is that old men sit in judgment and send young men off to war, some to die. Today we have young men and women fighting in the Gulf, fighting for our country. As with many of my colleagues, I have reservations, I have dis-

agreements, I have questions. But I think at this moment in time, it is important that we put aside those questions, disagreements and questions, if you will, about how we got to this point, to unify behind these young men and women and let them know that they have our full support, because we indeed are sending them off to fight and perhaps die.

So this evening, despite those reservations I may have, I am going to support this resolution. I hope my colleagues will do so as well and present to the world a united front of America, 100 percent behind our young men and women in harm's way. God bless these young men and women, and God bless America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed. I had hoped that this time, that this resolution which was brought forward this evening would bring us together as a House, and perhaps after having some partisan work and working on a policy, budget policy, which often divides us, we would come together and find some common ground in commending our troops and commending our President.

I think anybody who must be watching this from overseas must be wondering at this point, what is in this resolution that so many Members have come out from the Democrat side to condemn? I thought it might be good to go through the resolution, because this resolution is extremely similar to the resolution that we passed in 1991 after we took our first action in Iraq.

What did we do here? The whereas clauses talk about the fact that there was an Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 in which we stated it would be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein and to promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime. That vote passed, Mr. Speaker, overwhelmingly, Democrat and Republican. It also states that on October 16, 2002, the President signed into law House Joint Resolution 114 of the 107th Congress, the authorization, and I would say this clearly for my colleagues, many of whom probably voted against this, but nonetheless it was the authorization for the use of military force against Iraq. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, that vote passed 296-133. It passed overwhelmingly. It passed more overwhelmingly than the vote that we passed in 1991.

So what was so wrong with this resolution? This resolution followed the law, the steps that we took under the law, under United Nations resolution and under our own law that brought us to the culmination of this event in which it was necessary for the United States to interject force into the Iraq theater. We talked about Security Council Resolution 1441, now well known to most Members of this body that voted unanimously that Iraq will face serious consequences as a result of its continued violations of its obliga-

tions to disarm in accordance with all relevant United Nations resolutions.

It also said that Iraq remained in material breach of the relevant United Nations resolutions. That was clearly stated by the reports that were adopted by the United Nations. It was in material breach, and Saddam Hussein is in material breach of his obligations.

So just like the resolution in 1991, we followed the law. We followed this trail of steps, very patient steps that the United States took, including acts that were signed by a Democrat President, stating that it was our policy to bring about a free Iraq. That is what we state in this resolution that you think is so poorly worded.

What else did we do? When you get down to the meat of the resolution, and we talk about what it actually says, let us go to the resolved clause. First I want to go to the resolved clause that we passed in 1991 regarding the President and the troops and their families. We said in 1991 that we acclaim the President for his decisive leadership, unerring judgment and sound decisions. We say in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, that we express our support and appreciation to the President as Commander in Chief for his firm leadership and decisive action in the conduct of military operations in Iraq as part of the ongoing global war on terrorism.

□ 0200

Now, many of the faces that I see here who are condemning this resolution were thanking Mr. Rumsfeld a few hours ago for the clear judgment that is being shown by this administration in prosecuting this war. I had many Members come up to me from the Democrat side who said he was doing the right thing. They said we were lucky to have a person of that capability. We are lucky to have a team like this team that President George Bush has put together. So we commended our President because he is the Commander in Chief. We commended him in 1991. We commend him tonight.

What else did we do? In 1991 we expressed our highest commendation and sincerest appreciation to the members of the United States Armed Forces and other members of the international coalition who participated in Operation Desert Storm and have demonstrated exceptional bravery, dedication and professionalism.

Where is the trick language in this that you object to so much?

And what did we do in this resolution? We said that we express our appreciation "to the members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom," the present operation, "who are carrying out their missions with excellence, patriotism, and bravery." Where is the trick language there? Where is the double meaning?

Now we go to the families, and we say in this resolution "to the families of the United States military personnel

serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are providing support and prayers for their loved ones currently engaged in military operations in Iraq." We give the unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation. That is what we do in this.

What did we do in 1991? We said almost the same thing, and we conveyed our deepest sympathy and condolences to the families and friends of the United States and coalition forces who had been injured or killed during that operation.

So, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is extremely similar to the resolution that we passed in 1991, I might add, with a Democrat Congress, those words that I read to you about the President exercising unerring judgment even though many of the Democratic leadership had voted against this operation in a much closer vote, incidentally, than the vote to allow force that we took this fall. So they talked about his judgment, and many of them have talked privately about his good judgment in the present operation when we are referring to the present President.

The President and his team have done an excellent job. So maybe what we are really talking about is the cause. The many Members who I think did not represent a majority of the Democrat Party who came out here could have worked this resolution if they wanted it to say we do not really believe in the cause, but I do not think a majority of the Democrat Party wanted to say that because I do not think they believe it. I think they do believe in the cause. Do the Members know something else, Mr. Speaker? I think the people we are commending that we have been talking about all night believe in this cause, and maybe that is the difference between those people, those people wearing the uniform of the United States, and the people who wanted to use this forum to continue to debate this policy.

The facts are this body believes in this cause. We have given permission to the President to use our most valuable asset, our most precious resource, our Armed Forces, to ensure that this just cause is carried out. And, Mr. Speaker, since we have all given our foreign policy statements here tonight, maybe we should listen to the foreign policy statement of a Marine leader just before he took his people across that line, and I want to read a statement that was issued to every member of the First Marine Division before they went into operation today. It comes from the commanding general, J.N. Mattis, and this is what he states. Even though I am sure some Members of the other side could take exception to his language, this is his position:

"For decades Saddam Hussein has tortured, imprisoned, raped, and murdered the Iraqi people, invaded neighboring countries without provocation, and threatened the world with weapons of mass destruction. The time has come to end his reign of terror. On

your young shoulders rest the hopes of mankind.

"When I give you the word, together we will cross the line of departure close with those forces that choose to fight and destroy them. Our fight is not with the Iraqi people nor is it with members of the Iraqi Army who choose to surrender. While we move swiftly and aggressively against those who resist, we will treat all others with decency, demonstrating chivalry and soldierly compassion for people who have endured a lifetime under Saddam's oppression.

"Chemical attack, treachery, and the use of the innocent as human shields can be expected as can other unethical tactics. Take it all in stride. Be the hunter, not the hunted. Never allow your unit to be caught with its guard down. Use good judgment and act in the best interests of our Nation.

"You are part of the world's most feared and trusted force. Engage your brain before you engage your weapon. Share your courage with each other as we enter the uncertain terrain north of the Line of Departure. Keep faith in your comrades on your left and right and Marine air overhead. Fight with a happy heart and a strong spirit.

"For the mission's sake, our country's sake, and the sake of the men who carried the Division's colors in past battles, who fought for life and never lost their nerve, carry out your mission and keep your honor clean. Demonstrate to the world that there is 'No Better Friend, No Worse Enemy' than a United States Marine."

Ladies and gentlemen, those people that wear the uniform do not have the disagreement with this resolution that so many Members from the other side had tonight. They know this is a good cause. They believe in this cause. They share this cause. They also believe that they have a great President leading them.

May God bless them. May God bless America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for his eloquent statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

(Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of this resolution to support our men and women in harm's way serving this country.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Some discussion has been held tonight regarding foreign policy. Let me say my foreign policy. I speak of the valor and the courage and the dedication of young men and young women who are protecting freedom and safety of our country and of the free world, whether they be on the outskirts of Iraq or in Afghanistan or wherever they may be in this world. I hope everyone will see themselves clear to support and vote for this resolution so we

can say thanks to those brave souls of America. We have lost some, as was recently said this evening, whose families will grieve, but it is for us to carry on and say thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the great Roman orator once said that gratitude is the greatest of all virtues, and I hope tonight by this vote we can express our gratitude and exhibit that virtue by voting for this resolution.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, this evening I rise in strong support of the work that our U.S. Armed Forces are doing in Iraq and throughout the Middle East. However, I cannot support the resolution offered by my friend, Mr. Hunter. I truly believe that war is not the answer to this question facing the world community.

I truly believe that Saddam Hussein is an evil dictator and should not be allowed to oppress his people or threaten the rest of the world. Having said that, I would note that we should have given diplomacy a chance to work and more importantly, given the inspectors a chance to do their job to avert this military action.

As a New Yorker, no one understands the reality of terrorism more than me and the people of Brooklyn; we all lost family and friends that day and were all thankful for the outpouring of support we received from the nation and the world in wake of the September 11th tragedies. Having said that, after seeing my city attacked with my own eyes that day I believe that the actions of this administration are wrong and short sighted.

Once again, Mr. Speaker I stand with our troops this evening, but cannot commend those who would not work with the world community to find a peaceful solution to the problems that face our ever-shrinking world.

Tonight I say thank you to our troops and know that I am praying for their safe return to America, but cannot vote for this resolution because I do not believe this to be a just war.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I support the brave young men and women who are following orders that have placed them in harm's way. I hope and pray for their safe return. My thoughts and prayers are with them, their families and loved ones in this difficult time.

While I will always support the troops, I cannot support this mission. Last night, the President ordered an unprovoked aggressive attack against Iraq in violation of American traditions of defensive war.

This war is wrong. As a nation we must come together to support the troops, but continue to challenge the policy that has put them at grave risk.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for this resolution because, like every American, I want to see all of our troops come home safely and want to show my support for them and their families. I also want to see this war ended as quickly as possible, with a minimum of Iraqi casualties.

I am disturbed, however, about the partisan nature of this resolution. Instead of simply indicating our support for the troops, this resolution has language in it which some might suggest indicates support for the policies of the President which have led us to where we are today. Let me be very clear. I do not support those policies. I do not support the concept of "preemptive war." I do not support a foreign policy which undermines the United Nations,

and which alienates us from virtually all of our allies. I believe that all of these actions create a horrendous precedent which makes our country and our planet less safe, which could well result in more terrorism, not less terrorism. I voted against giving the President the authority to go to war in Iraq and I believe that history will determine that was the right vote.

Saddam Hussein is an evil dictator but I believe that, with the support of the international community and the United Nations, he could be contained and his weapons of mass destruction could be removed from him—without war and without killing and at a fraction of the cost that this war and occupation will cost. I also believe that with enforced and prolonged inspections, and with a strong commitment to human rights, the international community could bring democracy to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget the phenomenon of “blow-back,” or unintended consequences. The U.S., the most powerful military force on earth, will surely win this war in short order, but I’m not so sure that this victory will seem quite so clean and positive five years from now. I’m not so sure that the American occupation of Iraq will have all of the positive results that some think.

Let me conclude by expressing my outrage about how, at a time when young men and women are in the line of fire in Iraq, the Republican leadership, on this very night, is voting to cut the benefits of our veterans. On one hand we vote to “support the troops,” while on the other hand we vote to deny health care and other promised benefits to those veterans who fought in the first Persian Gulf War, or Vietnam, or Korea or World War II. What hypocrisy! Yes. We apparently have billions available for tax breaks for the rich, but not enough to keep the promises we made to our veterans.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the American men and women in uniform and their families who are providing key support and bearing such a heavy burden. Congress stands in solidarity with those given such a somber responsibility. This resolution is testimony to that unity.

My vote on this resolution affirms my support for our troops, but should not be mistaken as an affirmation of the administration’s foreign policies and diplomatic efforts, which I find wanting.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, nearly 250,000 men and women serving in the United States Armed Forces are deployed in Operation Iraqi Freedom. We have just had notice of the first casualties with the crash of a Marine helicopter. I would like to convey my condolences to their families; my heart and prayers are with them at this difficult time.

With the consideration of this resolution, I and every other Member of the United States House of Representatives wish to honor the courage and service of all our troops to this nation. Our thoughts and prayers are with them for their prompt and safe return home to their families.

The House of Representatives could have better demonstrated support this evening for members of the Armed Forces past and present during deliberation and votes on the Budget resolution. The resolution that just passed will cut veterans benefits and fails to fulfill the commitment to lifelong care and care of dependents made to our young men and women at the time of enlistment. I voted

against the Republican budget Resolution that mandated the cuts in veterans benefits. Instead I voted for an alternative budget resolution that would have fully funded veterans programs and met our nation’s obligation to those who have served selflessly in defense of our freedoms.

I will vote for this resolution to further demonstrate my support for our young men and women in the armed forces. I only wish that all those who join me in this vote had demonstrated a similar commitment when it came to full funding for veterans programs. In casting my aye vote for the troops, I want to note that I would have offered a motion to strike the whereas clause beginning at the bottom of page 2 extending to the top of page 3. I also find that the assertion at the end of line 6 ending on line 7 (p. 4) is not supported by any facts released by the CIA or other intelligence agencies and was, in fact, debunked in a publicly released CIA document last fall.

I have previously made known my concerns with the new policies of pre-emptive and preventative war. I have also spoken of the failure of the United States Congress to fulfill its duty under Article I Section 8, the duty to debate and declare war. Now, as we mourn the first casualties and honor our soldiers still on the front lines, is not the time to continue that debate despite the concerns I expressed earlier. However, there will come a day in the not too distant future when the House will no longer be able to avoid its duties.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my support for our troops and for this resolution.

First and foremost my heart and prayers are with the brave men and women of our Armed Forces who right now are engaged in a dangerous, but necessary war to rid the world of an evil dictator who threatens the world with his weapons of mass destruction. Our troops are courageously risking their lives for, not only the freedom and security of the people of the United States, but for the people of Iraq, and the entire world.

For 12 years, the United States and United Nations have called on Saddam Hussein to destroy his weapons of mass destruction. The U.N. passed 16 resolutions ordering him to do so. He has chosen not to comply. His history of using weapons of mass destruction, plus the likelihood that he could give these weapons of mass destruction to his agents in the U.S. or to terrorist organizations to use against Americans at home or abroad make him a clear and present danger to America.

The risks of this war are great, but the risks of not going to war to disarm Saddam Hussein now are far greater. With September 11 very much in my mind, I believe that our government must be proactive in protecting our people and our homeland.

I am mindful of, and have had extensive discussions with, the many people of good faith in my district who oppose taking action against Saddam Hussein at this point in time. I have great respect for them and for their strongly held views. But I hope that all Americans will join me today in supporting our troops as these brave young Americans place themselves in harm’s way on behalf of our nation.

I pray for the safety of the brave men and women in our armed forces and for the innocent Iraqi people. I look forward to the elimination of Saddam’s weapons of mass destruction and to the liberation of the Iraqi people from this murderous, sadistic dictator.

May God bless our troops and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 104.

The security of our Nation and the freedoms we enjoy will not be held hostage by a brutal dictator or terrorists whose only aim is to destroy our way of life. We will not live in fear.

The very real threat of an attack on America by terrorists who would use weapons of mass destruction cannot be left to chance. This risk is too great.

In the face of such threats, our current military action in Iraq, with our allies, is warranted.

As many of my colleagues have said before me this evening: Saddam Hussein must be stopped. His arsenal of terror must be eliminated. The terrorist networks with whom he allies himself must be destroyed. America must and will lead the free world to disarm Saddam Hussein and stop terrorism.

We have a duty to protect our people, and this we will do with courage and conviction.

This is the call to action our young men and women in uniform have heard, and for their sacrifices, we owe them our gratitude, our prayers and all of America’s support.

Our Commander in Chief has given our brave, young soldiers their orders. They are following those orders with precision, professionalism, compassion and courage. At the end of this battle, the world will be a safer place without Hussein, his anthrax, toxins and nerve gas, or the terrorists he aids and abets.

Our troops now go into battle to defend our Nation and protect our children’s future.

As those of us who have seen war know, the price of freedom is paid for by the sacrifices of those who serve. Their courage is our inspiration.

We wish them Godspeed, swift victory, and safe return.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, as I vote for this resolution tonight, I am mindful that many of my constituents remain opposed to United States action in Iraq, and believe it reflects an abuse of United States power which unnecessarily risks human life and sets us on a dangerous path for the future.

I want to explain to those constituents, whose views are heartfelt and well intended, why I respectfully disagree.

The President’s decision to use force to remove Saddam Hussein from power and eliminate his WMD was, indeed, controversial. I had hoped diplomacy would succeed, and that, even if it failed, the threat of imminent force would cause the Iraqi regime to seek exile.

One day, when we look back to write the history of these past months, we will undoubtedly conclude that there were many mistakes—some by the United States, many by our allies in the United Nations, and critical ones by Hussein and the leadership of Iraq. And we will learn from those mistakes.

But this resolution does not debate the issue of whether we should have gone to war. It merely expresses support and appreciation for those commanding the war, including the President as Commander in Chief, and for our young heroes, those in uniform,

who are courageously and skillfully carrying out their assigned missions.

Mr. Speaker, we must not make the mistake we made during and after the Vietnam war. This time, let's support the women and men serving in our Armed Forces—and, as importantly, welcome them home with open arms.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution commending our brave men and women of the armed services. I wish them Godspeed and a quick and decisive victory so they can return home soon and safe.

America is the greatest democracy the world has ever known. The advent of a new century has brought new threats and new terrors never before imagined that threaten our cherished freedoms and liberties. Fortunately, we have some of the finest citizens of our country who choose to serve to defend those cherished liberties, even at times, by giving their last full measure of their lives. They do it for their country, they do it for their families, and they do it for their buddies in the foxhole next to them, and thank God they do it well. Each generation has faced its own unique challenges and has risen to address them. Now it's our turn and I am confident that the current generation of servicemen and servicewomen will perform honorably and successfully. We are so very proud of them.

With military action to disarm Saddam Hussein just underway, my thoughts and prayers are with these men and women, as well as their families. Over 2,200 members of the Wisconsin Air and Army National Guard are serving on active duty as well as many Reservists from across the Badger State. Our appreciation not only goes out to them but also to their families and their employers for their support and sacrifice during these challenging times.

I want to particularly express my appreciation to the members and families of the Wisconsin Army National Guard's 229th Engineer Company out of Prairie du Chien and Platteville under the command of Capt. Robert Pruitt, the 829th Engineer Detachment out of Richland Center under the command of Capt. Kurt Geilfuss, and the 1158th Transportation Company with members from Tomah and Black River Falls under the leadership of 1LT Jason Stebbins, and Army Reserve's 652nd Engineer Company out of Ellsworth under the command of Capt. Dean Kasperek. These units have been activated and deployed. They can take great pride in knowing that they are part of the greatest military force the world has ever known and that they have the support of a grateful nation. We owe them a debt of gratitude that can never be repaid.

I also want to thank Maj. Gen. Al Wilkening, the Wisconsin Adjunct General and LTC Tim Donovan of the Wisconsin Army National Guard, along with Col. Mike Stazak, commander of Ft. McCoy, Army Reserve Total Force Training Center and his staff in western Wisconsin. The people of Wisconsin are proud of their service and the service of all the men and women of our armed services during this important time in our Nation's history.

As our military effort continues, I and other members of Congress will work to ensure that our service men and women have all the resources necessary to fulfill their mission. My thoughts and prayers are with those serving our country, as well as their families. America is firmly behind our troops and we're all hoping to see them home safe, secure, and soon.

May God bless our troops during this difficult time and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I, like many of my colleagues, worked to keep America's sons and daughters out of harm's way and to protect the innocent civilians of Iraq by encouraging the continuation of U.N. inspections and diplomatic efforts to gain the support of the United Nations Security Council.

I am deeply disappointed that the President instead has chosen to begin military action. But the fact is, since the decision was made to go to war, we must do everything in our power to support and protect our troops and to prevent civilian casualties.

I, like all Americans, am deeply grateful for the patriotism of our troops, their courage and the sacrifices they are willing to make. I join all Americans in praying for their prompt and safe return home to America and to their families.

Since September 11, 2001, Congress has worked in a bipartisan fashion to provide the tools necessary for our military forces to accomplish the difficult tasks given to them. I have supported these efforts because our fighting men and women deserve the very best. With our troops now engaged in conflict, Congress and the President must make certain that our armed force continue to promptly receive the necessary resource to end the war and to secure the peace when the conflict ends.

As the wife of a former Marine and as the stepmother of a proud member of the Army, I also want to thank our country's military families who share fully in the sacrifices of our military personnel. I will work with congressional leaders to continue to address the particular needs of these families during these difficult times and work to insure that full veteran benefits are available to them when they return.

The United States must continue diplomacy to bring together the broadest coalition to aid our efforts during and after the military conflict. America will need the support of our allies to help the people of Iraq rebuild their country.

Mr. Speaker, tonight our prayers and thoughts for our troops and innocent Iraqi civilians are perhaps best expressed by the American poet, Longfellow, who wrote so poignantly:

Our hearts, our hopes are all with thee.
Our hearts, our hopes our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee—are all with thee.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of this resolution that expresses our appreciation for our Armed Forces and their families. As a proud member of the Veterans Committee, I have worked to champion the causes of our brave men and women in uniform every day. As we enter a time of peril for our troops, and a time of concern in the hearts of their loved ones, it is important that the Congress is steadfast in our support.

I do have reservations, however, about the full content of this resolution. It mixes a statement of support for our troops, a sentiment that unites this Congress and our Nation, with support for the policies and plans of the administration—policies that remain controversial in this body and among many Americans.

It is the right—indeed, it is the duty—of elected representatives in a Democracy to question, to debate, and to voice the concerns of their constituents. This resolution seeks to

suppress all such concerns in a cynical act of politics, by forcing members either to vote in favor of all of the policies, or risk showing disdain for the troops. This kind of politicking has no place in what should be a pure and genuine expression of national unity.

I am voting for this resolution tonight because the sacrifice of our troops and their families deserves to be honored. But I object to the way in which this was brought forward, and I hope that this body will show a greater regard for all of the voices in our Nation in the future.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 104, a measure to honor our men and women in uniform and the families who support them.

Mr. Speaker, the meaning of this resolution strikes close to home because many men and women from my district are currently deployed overseas or they are in the cue to be deployed. There must be a remarkable level of stress associated with deployment. Uncertainty can be the largest contributor to this anxiety. Uncertain where they will be sent, uncertain as to what they will see. But rest assured, Mr. Speaker, there is no uncertainty in what they must do.

I know first hand that those airmen from the Air Force Special Operations Command, based at Hurlburt Field, are of the best trained, best equipped members in our United States Armed Forces. They go hand in hand with the Rangers who trained at Camp Rudder in the Northwest Florida swamps, the sailors who trained at Pensacola Naval Air Station and Whiting field, the Air Force Reservists from Duke Field and the airmen from the 33rd Fighter Wing, the Nomads, from Eglin Air Force Base.

These are the faces of our forces in Iraq. These men and women, mothers and fathers, daughters and sons, are the people who have volunteered to defend our freedom wherever a defense is needed. They protect the very fabric that gives protestors the right to protest, the editorialist the right to editorialize and the security where we can move about our day, completing our routine duties, without fear of oppression or persecution based on our simple, God-given rights.

As you, Mr. Speaker, I've seen many object to our efforts to liberate Iraq. I am deeply troubled by their lack of understanding as to what our troops are battling but at the same time I am proud of our Nation and the beacon of light we shine around the world—that those objections are permitted. Nobody here expects everyone to agree with every policy implemented. But I have yet to see a single protest against the Iraqi regime in downtown Baghdad. I would highly doubt the citizens in Iraq are truly comfortable with living a life of terror at the hands of their own government. I doubt they move about their daily routines without fear of persecution. I know they cannot assemble to oppose the government or publicize their written thoughts that run contrary to the views of the ruling regime.

Mr. speaker, we here in the United States, Western Europe and scores of other countries are fortunate to live in a land where life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are abundant, and I would submit, taken for granted. I look forward to the Iraqi people living in the same type of land and I thank the troops for bringing them to our welcoming arms.

May God bless and protect our men and women in Uniform and continue to bless the United States of America.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, as we speak and assemble on the floor of the House tonight, young men and women of our Armed Forces are ready to pay the ultimate sacrifice in the service of our Nation. Indeed, 12 American and four British soldiers died when their U.S. Marine helicopter crashed in Kuwait just hours ago. My condolences and prayers are with their families at this most difficult time.

About 3,600 of the troops honorably serving in the Persian Gulf today are from Fort Bliss in my own district. I have been fortunate and honored to meet many of them and their families. These men and women have already shown their remarkable abilities, manning Patriot missile battalions that successfully defended Kuwait and allied troops against Iraqi Scud missiles earlier today. I am very proud to represent these brave and capable soldiers. My thoughts and prayers are with them as they face the dangers and uncertainties of war. And my thoughts and prayers extend to their families as well, who must anxiously await their loved ones' safe return. The mothers and fathers, sons and daughters, wives and husbands, and brothers and sisters of our service members are making sacrifices of their own, and enduring a challenging time. They deserve our recognition and appreciation.

I commend all the members of our Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom for their patriotism, bravery, and professionalism. I also wish to express my appreciation to the British and Australian troops who are fighting alongside Americans in combat, and to the personnel from other allied countries who are providing support to our forces.

I support our Government's efforts to prosecute this war swiftly and successfully, with a minimum of military and civilian casualties. Our soldiers deserve our fullest support, and they can count on me for that for however long this war may last.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the men and women of our armed services. These courageous Americans are putting their lives on the line in order to serve our country, and I pray that they succeed swiftly in their mission and return home safely.

I also want to express my support for the families of our troops, who are patiently awaiting their return with heavy hearts. My thoughts and prayers go out to you during these difficult times.

While I fully support our troops, I am frustrated and deeply disappointed by the resolution that we are being asked to consider tonight. I vehemently disagree with the President's decision to abandon a diplomatic solution to disarm Saddam Hussein, and cannot support a resolution that endorses that decision.

I was proud to support H.J. Res. 27 two weeks ago, a resolution commending the service of our Armed Forces. However, it is with a heavy heart that I must oppose the resolution we have before us tonight.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I back this resolution because of my complete support and admiration of the brave men and women in our armed services. Each of us owes a debt of gratitude to these selfless individuals who have put themselves in harm's way in service of our Nation. Like many of my fellow Ameri-

cans, I still disagree with the process that brought us to this juncture and my vote here does not represent any change in that belief. But I pray for a quick end to this conflict and for the safe return of all of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of H. Con. Res. 104. It is very fitting that we honor those men and women who tonight are making the world a safer place. Their mission is legal and, more importantly, just. I am certain they will succeed in changing an evil regime, they will succeed in eliminating dangerous chemical and biological weapons, and they will succeed in liberating the people of Iraq.

Our thoughts and prayers must also go out to the families of our troops. Their sacrifice is great and must be acknowledged.

There is no greater love than the love of a family, so as a nation, as family America, we must send our love to families whose members are in harm's way defending our freedom.

And finally recognizing our President for his leadership, his strength, his decency and his commitment to the American people.

I hope and pray for a swift and safe return for all of our troops. May God bless our military and their families. And may God bless America.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to vote to support our brave armed forces. I will vote for this resolution. My thoughts and prayers are with the men and women in uniform who are serving our country in the Persian Gulf and elsewhere. They will, without doubt, perform admirably. While I am disappointed that this resolution contains dubious and politically opportunistic language regarding Iraq and the war on terrorism, that cannot stop me from endorsing the valor and dedication of our troops. Although I remain concerned that this war will make our country less instead of more safe, I deeply respect the personal sacrifice and commitment of our armed forces. Our democracy permits and even encourages disagreement, but it cannot tolerate disrespect towards our men and women in uniform.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, as we vote today to commend our troops, I would like to take the opportunity to express my personal support for our brave men and women in uniform who are in harm's way, and to hope for their safe return home after a victory on the battlefield.

The time for debate over the wisdom of going to war has passed. Although I was unsuccessful in arguing that such a war be undertaken only after the passage of a constitutionally-enacted Declaration of War, it is time now for us to line up behind our troops. As a Vietnam era veteran of the U.S. Air Force I understand how important it is to troop morale that each and every fighting person know all Americans stand behind them.

Once this war has ended we should seriously reconsider the direction of our foreign policy. The American people have seen the ineffectiveness of our reliance upon our so-called "NATO allies" and the United Nations. Hopefully this will lead us to reconsider our role in these organizations. I hope this will be the last time Americans fight under the color of U.N. resolutions. Once this war is completed I hope we will reassess our foreign entanglements, return to the traditional U.S. foreign policy of non-intervention, and return to the standard of our own national security.

For now all such foreign policy debates are on hold, and I hope all Americans will join in supporting our troops in the successful completion of their mission.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my unequivocal support of our men and women in uniform currently participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom. I would also like to thank my colleague Chairman HUNTER for bringing this important and timely resolution to the floor.

As we speak, our armed forces are beginning the second day of their quest to end the reign of one of the most diabolical tyrants the world has ever known. As they advance on their objective, the professionalism and abilities of our troops are obvious. These brave men and women—so far from home—bear upon their shoulders the task of keeping the world safe so that the rest of us can enjoy the comforts of freedom.

While no one doubts that ultimate success will be theirs, the dangers our troops face are all too real. Not long ago we received the sad news that a helicopter crash has claimed the lives of 12 U.S. Marines and 4 British soldiers. It is unlikely these casualties will be the last, but we are comforted in the knowledge that the sacrifices they have made will help make the world a safer place.

Saddam Hussien had ample opportunity to join the peace-loving nations of the world, but he refused at every turn. Thus, if falls to our troops to finally put an end to his murderous regime. Earlier today they crossed the line of departure, and are now closing with those enemy forces that chose to put up resistance. But more important than the fear they bring to the allies of Saddam is the hope they bring to the Iraqi people, who soon will see their great and ancient civilization flourish once again.

As for Saddam, he will experience for a second time that there is no great friend, no worse enemy than a member of the U.S. military.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support our brave troops in harm's way, as they fight to disarm Saddam Hussein of his weapons of mass destruction.

My gratitude and prayers are with the 270,000 brave American troops at war to protect the American people, including 2,512 Minnesota National Guard and Reserve Troops.

Mr. Speaker, politics stops when war starts. It's time for all members of this body to take off their political hats and put on their American hats in support of our troops. At time of war, there are no Republicans, no Democrats and no Independents, only Americans.

As Americans, we have the will power and the staying power to accomplish this mission and bring our troops home safely.

Thanks to our brave troops, I am confident we will be successful at disarming this brutal and murderous dictator of his weapons of mass destruction. And for that, Mr. Speaker, they deserve our deepest gratitude, respect and prayers.

May God bless our troops and our Commander-in-Chief, and may God bless America!

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I stand 100% behind our troops. The brave men and women in uniform who have volunteered to defend our country are in my thoughts, and in my prayers. I pledge to work to ensure that they have all the resources necessary to help them accomplish their mission quickly and safely so that they can return home to their families.

I also pray for the family members who sent their loved ones into harm's way to protect the freedom that every American enjoys. They are to be commended for their sacrifice and unwavering support for our troops.

My home state of Florida has sent over 5,000 Reserve and National Guard personnel to Iraq with the full understanding that not all of them would return to their families and loved ones, and my heart goes out to these brave Floridians.

Every member of our Armed Forces deserves our deep and unending gratitude for their professionalism and commitment to the ideals of this great country.

For the record, I would like to express my support for the second and third Whereas clause of the resolution we are currently debating, and I would like to submit Congressman HASTINGS' Resolution support the troops which I support in its entirety.

May God continue to bless America.

H. CON. RES.—

Whereas the valiant and dedicated members of the United States Armed Forces consistently perform in an exceptionally professional manner befitting an all-volunteer military force;

Whereas the members of Reserve and National Guard components of the Armed Forces consistently demonstrate their readiness and ability to respond and deploy quickly to become an integral part of the active components;

Whereas the families of the active and reserve forces provide exceptional and unwavering support for deployed forces;

Whereas the valiant members of the military forces of the allies of the United States share common goals and objectives with the United States in the war on terrorism and the war with Iraq; and

Whereas all citizens of the United States and the allies of the United States have demonstrated a show of unity in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and against the threat to global security and crimes against humanity posed by Iraqi President Saddam Hussein: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) each member of the Armed Forces of the United States be commended for serving with such distinction and professionalism;

(2) the family members of members of the Armed Forces of the United States be commended for their special role in providing support for the members of the Armed Forces;

(3) each allied service member be commended for serving with such distinction and professionalism; and

(4) all citizens of the United States pay homage to the members of the Armed Forces and their families and to allied service members and their families.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to the order of the House earlier this legislative day, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 95.

□ 0210

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013, with Mr. ISAKSON (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier this legislative day, amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 108-44, as modified, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) had been disposed of.

It is now in order for a period of final debate on the concurrent resolution.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I will close our side of the debate, and I only have one speaker. I believe I have that opportunity to do so; so I allow the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) to go first.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to claim my time and make a closing statement.

Mr. Chairman, this is not just another partisan vote. This is a pivotal vote with long-lasting consequences, and I urge everybody to ponder those consequences and beg everyone's indulgence at this hour to make just a few comments. When I came to this House 20 years ago, the Government was deep in debt. Over the 1980s the national debt tripled. It took us almost 20 years to rid the Government's budget of deficits. It took Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, which passed in 1985, the Budget Summit Agreement in 1990, the Clinton Budget of 1993, and the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997.

These efforts finally bore fruit. After we passed the Clinton act in 1993, each

year thereafter for 7 straight years, the bottom line of the budget got better to the point where in 1993 for the first time in 30 years the budget was in balance.

□ 0215

Mr. Bush took office with an advantage few Presidents in recent times have enjoyed. He had a surplus, a big-time surplus. The Office of Management and Budget, OMB, estimated from 2002 through 2011, the surplus would be \$5.6 trillion.

Based on that projection and over the admonitions of many of us, Mr. Bush requested and Congress passed \$1.35 trillion in tax cuts. Now, just 2 years later, that \$5.6 trillion surplus is gone. That is what CBO and OMB told us when we opened the budget season in January of this year.

OMB told us that it had overstated the surplus. Adjusting it for what we now know about the economy, they said the adjusted surplus is not \$5.6 trillion from 2002 through 2011, it is more like \$2.4 trillion, and, more than that, about \$2.5 trillion has already been committed in new tax cuts and newly legislated spending, much of it for national defense. This means that any new tax cuts we pass will go straight to the bottom line. They will add dollar for dollar to the deficit.

In 2001, you could rationalize an enormous tax cut on the grounds that we had an enormous surplus, but you cannot do that anymore. Nevertheless, the President sent us a budget this year requesting another \$1.6 trillion in tax cuts, another round of tax reduction, as large as the last, with only a few modest offsets in it. All of it goes to the bottom line. When CBO did its analysis of the President's budget, it saw nothing but deficits, on-budget deficits, totaling over \$5 trillion between now and 2013.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget and his colleagues embraced the President's tax cuts. They totaled some \$1.6 trillion, but they pared them down a bit, and then they went looking for offsets. They weren't able to identify specific spending offsets, so they settled on just across-the-board percentage cuts to entitlement spending under the jurisdiction of 14 different committees. Initially they asked for \$470 billion in entitlement spending. They settled later for less because they needed the votes to get it passed on their side of the aisle.

Today we have some \$262 billion in entitlement cuts entailed by this budget resolution. These will come out of programs within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, that is Medicare; and the Committee on Energy and Commerce, that is Medicaid, \$107 billion.

So if you vote for this resolution, you should know that you are still voting very possibly to cut Medicare by \$62 billion, Medicaid by \$107 billion, government pensions and railroad retirement by over \$40 billion, veterans' disability benefits by \$15 billion, school

lunches and student loans by nearly \$10 billion, and all of this is occasioned by the fact that you want to go forward with this tax cut of \$1.3 trillion to \$1.4 trillion. Because without it, the budget will be in balance between 2008 and 2010, if you just let the spending increase each year at the level of current service.

You should also know that this resolution calls for limits on domestic discretionary spending that will make it lower than inflation or current services by \$244 billion over the next 10 years. It has been claimed on this House floor that these were just cuts of 1 percent, but when you provide for a big increase in international affairs, \$51 billion is what the President sought over 10 years, and another big increase in homeland security, the rest of the accounts in discretionary spending have to be squeezed, and by our calculations they are squeezed easily by 6 percent.

That may not seem crippling, but look what is happening to education in this budget. Education is brought in \$50 billion below inflation. At this level we will never fully fund Leave No Child Behind; we will never get close to sharing our fair share of IDEA. That is true for other programs throughout the discretionary accounts. Veterans' health care, for example, it is cut by \$13 billion to \$15 billion, although today right now it has more veterans than it can say grace over to care for.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply doubt that these cuts will ever be achieved. Let us not forget what happened last year. We only passed 2 of 13 appropriations bills in 2002, did not finish the last 11 until a few weeks ago, and those were hard to pass because they had spending restraints on them that are a lot less challenging than what this bill will call for.

So what happens if the cuts are not achieved? The deficit goes higher, we stack up a mountain of debt. But, unlike the 1980s, we are right now on the eve of the retirement of the baby-boomers, and that will make the task of turning these deficits around more intractable and difficult than ever, believe me.

So, before you vote for this resolution, you should ask yourself if you want to take this gamble. You should know that even if all the mandatory and discretionary spending cuts are achieved, which is very, very unlikely, this budget will not be in balance until 2012, a long time from now, and between now and then this budget will accumulate more than \$1 trillion of additional debt. And in voting for this resolution, keep in mind, you are voting to raise the ceiling on the national debt.

So, what happens if we do not vote for this resolution? What happens if we vote it down tonight? Well, the default option is not really that bad. If you forego the tax cuts and you can also forego the spending cuts, you can put the budget back in balance by 2008. If you believe in balanced budget, if you

think deficits are a menace, that is not a bad outcome. I suggest to you it is a lot better outcome than the budget resolution before us.

Vote no on the budget resolution. Let us go back to the drawing board.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we always hear a lot about history whenever the Democrats come to the floor to talk about the budget, and it is in part because they do not want to talk about the future. They really just want to talk about history. They want to redefine it, they want to recapture it, they want to put it in new context constantly.

How did we get here? Because of a war, because of a national emergency, and because of an economy that has been in recession, and we have to address all of those needs today. We have to have a plan for the future.

Just like we commended our troops tonight, it is time to do our job. Yes, it is late. Yes, there are people who are asked to do much harder work than we are asked to do. But it is time to do our part in all of this. This budget is just the first step.

I have heard people tonight on both sides of the aisle talk about all sorts of devastating things that might happen, devastating things that will happen, all sorts of policies that will flow from this budget that has not even passed yet, that has not even been conferred with the Senate yet. We do not know where this process will end up, but I will guarantee you one thing: At the end of the day, no one will like it. No one will think it is a perfect budget. I can attest to that, because even though when I started this process I kind of liked what I wrote, by the end of it, I am not even sure I will recognize all of the details that are in this budget.

Why is that? Because 435 people in this body and 100 in the other body write the budget. This is not the Nussle budget, it is not the President's budget, it is not the Blue Dogs' or the Republican Study Committee's or the moderates' or the conservatives'. It is nobody's budget unless we get it done.

Why is it important for us to get it done? Because just last year we did not get it done. We passed one in the House, the other body did not pass a budget, and what happened? Gridlock, breakdown, 7 months of wrangling on the floor over 13 appropriations bills that only attributed one-third of all of the spending that Congress does and the Federal Government participates in. Seven months we spent over just one-third of the budget because of total budget breakdown.

So we need to pass a budget. We need a conference report. We need to have a plan. And what should that plan say? Well, we believe it needs three things:

Number one, it is not negotiable. We must protect America. That means strong national defense and homeland security that gives us the kind of secu-

rity we need to have to ensure that we can protect freedom at home and freedom around the world.

Number two, we must strengthen the economy and create jobs. A person without a job is not paying any taxes, and a person who is not paying any taxes, more than anything else, knows that they are not able to make ends meet. A person with a job, that is the most important thing we can do is to get people back to work.

So, yes, we reduce taxes. Yes, we take on taxes, because they are too complicated, they are too high, they are too onerous, and it has gone on too long. We have got to do something about taxes. The President has put a plan on the table. Yes, we incorporate that plan in our budget, but it is a first step to getting us back to work as a country.

The third area is fiscal responsibility. Now, I have heard the gentleman from South Carolina, whom I greatly respect, say that we will not achieve these cuts. He is right. We are not going to achieve these cuts, because they are not cuts. How can you cut when you are only decreasing anticipated increases on the one hand, and, on the other hand, when it is waste?

Why is it in America, for some reason in Washington, that whenever an agency or department or program wastes money, we rush in and give it more?

GAO, our General Accounting Office, if you want to talk about waste, we hire great people who put together reams and volumes and all sorts of reports; defense acquisitions, financial management, FAA, Medicaid, Medicare, U.S. Postal Service, food stamp program, tax administration. It goes on and on and on in waste.

We are paying dead people benefits under the Veterans Administration. We are sending dead people checks under Social Security. There are folks in the Lorton prison that are getting benefits under welfare still. And this is under a reformed welfare system.

People will come up to me and say, "Gosh, do you know what is really tough? We cannot find that waste. We are having a real tough time." And our friends on the other side are saying, "You are cutting, throwing children in the street. People will be kicked out of nursing homes."

We are after this. This is what we are after. We want to find the waste, fraud and abuse within our system. Is it going to be hard? You bet, because for 5 years we have not been doing it.

Five years ago we reached a balanced budget. Why? Because the Republicans took the majority. We put in a 7-year plan to balance the budget. We got there 4 years earlier than we said because the economy was growing, and we controlled spending. But when we got to balance, we stopped working on spending. We have got to get back to working on the spending side of the budget.

So, this is where I end here tonight with a quote. It is kind of an interesting quote, apropos for tonight, I believe. The quote is, "We shall, therefore, neither postpone our tax cut plans nor cut into essential national security programs. This administration is determined to protect America's security and survival, and we are also determined to step up its economic growth. I think we must do both."

President Kennedy said that in 1962. Let us do that job again tonight. Let us vote on the budget.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to highlight how the administration's budget leaves children and families behind. As we begin debate on the FY2004 Federal budget, we must remember that the biggest challenge facing American families is how to bridge their responsibilities between work and caring for their families.

Our children and our families need our help now, more than ever, as this country is involved in a pre-emptive war with Iraq; this is especially true today for the families of our troops, national guard and reservists.

Whether already deployed, or waiting for their orders, these brave men and women and their families are wondering how they'll make ends meet as they fulfill their military duty. How will they juggle their work and family responsibilities as well as their Nation's call?

What we need is a budget that invests adequately in the programs and safety net that help all families balance work and family responsibilities.

That's why it's bad policy that the Republican budget cuts many crucial programs that help parents and children.

For instance, under the President's FY2004 plan after-school programs are cut by nearly \$400 million and cuts necessary funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Under the President's budget, CHIP will be jeopardized by a plan to merge it with Medicaid programs through a new block grant.

States will have unprecedented latitude to scale back coverage of necessary care for children, impose substantial cost-sharing requirements on low-income families, and put many children in a position to have no coverage for their health care.

Child care services—which provide care so parents can work knowing their kids are safe—are also being cut. Only 1 in 7 children eligible for Federal child care assistance currently receive the funding they need. Under the President's plan a funding freeze will mean approximately 30,000 low-income children lose child care help in 2004.

Programs such as Head Start will also suffer. Head Start, the premiere early childhood program for disadvantaged preschoolers would be dismantled and sent to the States, without the performance standards that are the core of the program's success.

Mr. Chairman, this budget fails to provide the support that many of our working families depend on to give their children the best possible care. Families need this financial and emotional support to keep it all together. In fact, it seems that whatever we do in this fast-paced competitive society requires a balancing act.

All families can use a little help, yet, families are told that this is their own "personal problem"—although most everyone experiences

it—and "don't look to Washington for help, the Federal Government has other priorities" such as a \$400 billion defense budget to champion or a \$675 billion tax break for the wealthiest few.

What I propose is that we need a common vision of how to assist the struggling families of our country. A balancing act would recognize that there is no more important job than parenting.

A balancing act would give parents the opportunity to stay at home for at least the first three months after a birth, or an adoption, without the loss of income or employment.

A balancing act would see that when parents go back to work they would have access to quality child care.

A balancing act would provide voluntary universal pre-school for every three- and four-year old.

A balancing act would ensure that all children are cared for . . . not just during the school day, but after school as well. Instead of kids hanging out in the street with lesson in drugs, alcohol and early pregnancy, let's have safe places and enriching experiences available for our kids . . . places where they want to be . . . where they are safe and where they now they are cared about.

A balancing act would address the sad fact that in too many families, breakfast is a casualty of the new economy and our fast paced life. When kids go to school on an empty stomach, they can't learn.

And finally, a balancing act would extend benefits to part time workers. Whether an employee works 40 hours or less, their contribution to the company is just as great. All parents, and their families deserve to be protected against illness and loss of employment.

Mr. Chairman, our first priority in this budget must be helping working families find a balance between their work and home responsibilities. I encourage my colleagues to remember children and families as we debate the FY2004 Budget.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, if Republicans are trying to send a message with this budget, the bright neon lights spell "working families don't count." This is a budget of missed opportunities, misguided plans and misplaced priorities. This budget does not even account for the war, and reduces or eliminates benefits to the same brave soldiers that are waging that war as we speak.

This budget is missing any serious recognition of the devastating economic downturn our Nation has suffered during this administration or of the severe budget crisis facing the states.

The budget fails to invest in what matters most to American working families:

It does nothing to rebuild or modernize our schools. It does nothing to improve our nation's aging transportation system.

It does nothing to patch the holes in our homeland security framework.

It does nothing to stem the relentless loss of jobs in our nation's manufacturing and industrial base.

It does nothing to create new jobs.

Small businesses form the entrepreneurial backbone of our Nation's economy. Most new jobs in this country come from businesses started only from a little seed money and a big dream. Yet, this budget cuts the very Small Business Administration programs that help keep the American Dream alive.

This dream is being lived, at this very moment, by the hard working owners of countless Section 8A-small businesses. These businesses provide services to our government that are often less expensive and higher quality than many large corporations.

We must oppose a budget that bundles small business contracts together into larger contracts that only multinational and large corporations will be able to bid on.

This budget also does nothing to solve our Nation's crippling health care crisis, which means high cost and little coverage to working families. It also means a consistent 15 percent yearly cost increase to employers who are becoming less willing to pay for their workers' health care.

This budget leaves behind the \$9 billion in funding that President Bush promised for education. This budget leaves behind 40 percent of the funding for after school programs, 26 percent of the funding to migrant education programs, 43 percent of the funding for high school equivalency programs, 13 percent of early education programs, and the list goes on.

I wish my Republican colleagues understood that it is neither apathy nor laziness that makes people poor and creates under-performing schools. Even where the budget seeks new funds for neglected priorities, the approach to solving the problem is deeply flawed and the conditions are unfair and counterproductive.

During a time of corporate scandals, Republicans choose instead to go after labor unions. The Department of Labor is even increasing its funding to audit, investigate, and prosecute labor unions. It increased its funding by closing down the United States Employment Service.

During a time of state budget shortfalls that are forcing deep cuts to education, this budget instead redirects critical education funding to private school vouchers so that he can begin to privatize public education.

During a time of soaring energy prices, the Republican budget freezes funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, so our seniors can bake in the summer and freeze in the winter.

Seniors will be forced to leave Medicare to get a prescription drug care benefit, only to be covered by HMOs that will provide less care for more money.

Our seniors are concerned that this budget puts the long-term solvency of social security in serious jeopardy.

This budget will have a record of \$1.8 million deficit over the next 10 years. This reckless deficit must be paid off, but how? Republicans hope to indebt our Nation to the point where we have no choice but to privatize Social Security. We must strengthen Social Security—not privatize it!

The current state of our economy demands investments to help people, but Republicans are instead squandering the funds on tax cuts. The resources that the budget seeks fall well short of basic needs—a direct result of the President's obsession with butchering the tax code and wringing from it trillions in tax breaks for the wealthiest. Tax breaks that are breaking the backs of our State budgets. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the President tucked 11 tax cut proposals in his budget that would have disastrous effects on State budgets. Talk about kicking someone when they are down!

The tax cuts will cost the States \$64 billion in revenues over the next 10 years. Those are \$64 billion dollars that would have funded our police and funded our schools. Eleven States have cut their spending on K–12 education, delaying much-needed renovation and construction, eliminating preschool and after-school programs and, in some places, cutting days from the school week. Nineteen States have cut higher education spending, forcing cancellation of classes and tuition hikes.

Eighteen States have cut their welfare programs, even though the rolls are rising for the first time since passage of the 1966 welfare reform law. The number of States with waiting lists for child care assistance has grown, and the waits are getting longer. In seven States, eligibility for child care aid has been tightened significantly, and five States have hiked parent fees.

Twelve States are cutting Medicaid. At least 1 million people, largely in working poor families, will lose their health care coverage if these cuts are fully implemented. Another 1 million are experiencing cuts in coverage and benefits.

Many States have implemented or are considering tax increases to raise revenues. Among the 34 governors who have submitted 2004 budgets, 16—Republicans and Democrats—have called for increases in taxes and fees. Three are proposing personal income tax hikes, seven recommend sales tax increases or an end to sales tax exemptions, five propose corporate tax hikes and three are considering various other fees and levies. Ironically, these State tax hikes, many of which will hit low- and moderate-income residents, may offset any Federal cuts.

This budget and the tax cuts are clear examples of how Republicans want to shift the tax burden of our Nation from the rich to the working class.

Around this time last year, I led a successful effort to restore food stamp benefits to legal permanent residents. Although the President signed the law, this budget does not fund our commitment to keeping all lawful residents of our Nation fed. We cannot approve monumental reforms that bring hope to people's hearts and then coldly deny the funding for these very same programs.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget. It's a budget that sends its message—in bright neon lights—"real people don't matter."

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this budget resolution, which undermines our long-term fiscal health and severely hampers our ability to meet critical domestic needs and foreign responsibilities.

I stand united with the President and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in our commitment to win the war against Iraq and take all necessary steps to defeat terrorism and preserve national security both at home and abroad. However, despite the many new security and economic challenges confronting us, the war and our homeland protection efforts should not, and need not, shortchange our domestic priorities. We can win the war against Iraq and terrorism without raiding Social Security and Medicare and without increasing the national debt. Yet, this Republican budget resolution would accomplish just the opposite.

Two years ago, the administration and Congress were looking covetously at a staggering

\$5.6 trillion cumulative surplus through 2010. At the time, Congress was continually reassured by the administration that we could afford an enormous tax cut, ensure the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, pay down the national debt, fund our domestic priorities and still have a large reserve fund for unanticipated emergencies. Like many of my colleagues, I cautioned the administration at the time that its budget and enormous tax cut were based on unrealistic surplus projections that would never materialize.

Earlier this year, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) confirmed that in less than 2 years the 10-year projected surplus has been erased. While portions of this decline are a result of our efforts to defeat terrorism and preserve national security both at home and abroad, the depletion of the surplus to date was largely caused by the fiscally irresponsible policies of 2001. The additional \$1.3 trillion in tax cuts, much of which are due to excluding dividends from taxation, that the administration and the Republican leadership propose would only worsen our current situation and lead us further down the path of mounting deficits and escalating public debt.

To pay for the additional tax cuts, the Republican's budget resolution would raid the entire \$2.2 trillion Social Security trust fund to cover deficits in the rest of the Federal budget over the next 10 years. Moreover, the projections used to frame this budget are overly optimistic. They do not include the cost of the administration's plan to permanently extend several expiring tax cuts, which would add \$100 billion to the deficit between 2004 and 2013. In addition, this budget omits the cost of extending relief from the selling individual Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) beyond 2005. Without AMT relief, the number of taxpayers subject to it will soar from 2 million today to over 43 million by 2013. The projections also leave out an assessment of the enormous cost of the current war and the subsequent costs of occupation, which could last for a number of years.

The disappearance of the 10-year surplus compels us to consider not just a 1-year but also a long-term budget plan. Congress and the American people have the right to know how the Republican Leadership proposes to restore fiscal discipline while enacting additional multi-year tax cuts, boosting spending for the military, and meeting commitments to a growing number of retirees. Furthermore, I find it incredibly irresponsible that the majority continues to pursue large tax cuts while short-changing important domestic priorities. Congress should devise budgetary rules that make tax cuts contingent on the realization of specified targets for the budget surplus and the Federal debt. Unfortunately, this budget fails on all those accounts.

Moreover, this budget would cut domestic appropriations by \$244 billion over 10 years below the amount needed to maintain services at the 2003 level. Remarkably, the funding levels in this budget are \$115.3 billion lower than the level in the President's budget, which many Members—on both sides of the aisle—thought was too low. Further, it would require cuts of \$265 billion over 10 years in programs such as Medicaid, veterans' benefits, student loans, housing assistance and pensions and benefits for Federal employee. This budget also fails to provide funds for necessary infrastructure improvements or help hard-pressed

states and localities. Meanwhile, it provides an inadequate prescription drug benefit, and underfunds other key priorities without reaching balance until 2012.

Instead, I plan to support the Democratic alternative that would eliminate the unfair, costly tax cuts for the rich, and would provide targeted tax rebates to working families, as well as additional funding for expanded unemployment benefits for laid off workers, assistance for states and localities, and necessary infrastructure projects. It would also provide greater funding for Medicare prescription drugs, education, housing, homeland security and other vital domestic programs. This alternative would provide an immediate boost to the economy and create thousands of jobs, without aggravating our long-term deficits.

The need to respond to new short-term needs is no excuse for ignoring the long-term problems we already have. Ultimately, deficits do matter. It is time that we all take the deteriorating budget outlook seriously. We need to ensure that the burden of today's fiscal policies is not placed on the shoulders of our children and grandchildren. This is a matter of fiscal stewardship and generational responsibility, and we must address it without delay.

I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided budget and to develop one that will ensure security at home and abroad, without dramatically increasing our debt, borrowing against Social Security and Medicare, or abandoning our commitments to children, workers, senior citizens and all Americans.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, today we are brought to the floor of this House as America's young men and women are at war in Iraq. The American people expect their elected representatives to address how much this war will cost and how much securing our hometowns will cost in our continuing war against terrorism as well. Instead, the Bush administration is asking this Congress to treat as its highest budget priority the lifting of that very onerous burden felt by the wealthiest of Americans—the double taxation of dividends. We all know what a huge burden double taxation of dividends imposes on the wealthiest Americans. Apparently Republican Party leaders in Washington feel that failing to lift this burden from the shoulders of the rich would be too great a sacrifice, even in wartime. For them, lifting the burden of double taxation of dividends is:

More important than paying for a war in Iraq and the subsequent rebuilding of Iraq.

More important than paying for security at our ports, airports, and nuclear power plants; and

More important than providing affordable health care and medicine to our grandparents.

Last night, President Bush officially created a whole new group of 250,000 war veterans—yet he does not even have enough money in his budget to take care of this country's obligations to veterans of the first Persian Gulf War, the Vietnam War, the Korean War, or World War II.

Never before has a President cut taxes in the face of war. According to the New York Times, the Civil War gave birth to an estate tax and World War II expanded the income tax. But during the war in Iraq the Bush administration plans to cut taxes by a total of nearly \$2 trillion over the next 10 years.

This tax cut for the rich is a fiscal MOAB [Mother of All Bombs], pointed right at the heart of the Federal budget.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, it seems that each year I've been in Congress, the Republican budget proposal is further and further removed from the needs and expressed wishes of the American public. This year follows that disturbing trend. Fundamental priorities and long-term fiscal stability are sacrificed for the sake of continued tax cuts.

This budget puts into place a framework that will fail to meet our needs. It ignores funding requirements for our operations overseas, our actions in Iraq and a commitment to rebuild and stabilize Afghanistan. Worst of all it ignores real problems here at home. There is no meaningful assistance for the 47 states, including mine, that are in serious financial difficulty, to say nothing of the unmet needs for transportation, environmental cleanup and "hometown" security.

We must look at this current budget as an opportunity, despite the fact that we are now at war and our economy continues to stumble. We have a choice whether we want deficits as far as the eye can see. We have a choice whether we want to provide tax cuts to the detriment of education, healthcare and the environment. The Democratic budget alternatives we are voting on today are far better in addressing these choices.

The Democratic budget alternatives:

Invest in our communities, which creates jobs, provides needed infrastructure improvements for transportation and water, and cleans up the environment;

Help state and local governments cope with their current budget crises and provides money for "hometown" security and the first responders that protect our communities;

Provide increased funding for discretionary healthcare programs and education, reducing classroom sizes and providing advanced teacher training—proposals President Bush promised but the Republicans refuse to fund; and

Offer tax cuts and reforms that are much more affordable and equitable. They repeal the marriage penalty, provide immediate and permanent estate tax relief that increases the family exclusion level to \$6 million, and accelerate the child tax credit to \$800 per child. Other tax cuts would be deferred if the budget remains in deficit because of the war in Iraq or other factors.

My constituents and the American people understand that these are extraordinary times. They are willing to make the sacrifices necessary to protect our communities, to educate our children, and to clean our environment. We have an opportunity to help families become safer, healthier, and more economically secure. The Democratic budget alternatives seize this opportunity.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my concern about the budget resolution before us today. As a Member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am especially concerned about the amount of funding included in the budget resolution for our Nation's veterans.

This Republican budget is woefully short of what is needed, and I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic budget alternative. Our alternative provides \$32 billion more than the Republican budget over the next 10 years for veterans. This means providing \$17 billion more for veterans' health care and rejecting the Republican cut of \$15 billion for mandatory veterans' programs, programs like service-

connected disability compensation, pensions, survivors' benefits, vocational rehabilitation, educational and burial benefits. I cannot imagine even thinking about cuts to compensation for our disabled veterans!

The Democratic budget is supported by the authors of the Independent Budget, a budget created by veterans' service organizations who are on the front lines and in a position to know exactly what is needed. They call the Democratic alternative "a solid step forward in meeting the very real needs of veterans".

This morning I attended the joint Senate and House VA Committee hearing, where we heard views on the budget from the Vietnam Veterans of America, the American Ex-Prisoners of War, the Military Officers Association of American, and AMVETS. I must report that for much of the hearing, there were only two Members present to receive the veterans testimony.

On the day following the beginning of the war with Iraq, it is hard to believe that most of the Members of the VA Committee were too busy to attend this hearing about funding for our veterans' programs. Perhaps our Republican colleagues were reworking their original budget resolution, working to respond to the outcries from veterans and the public about their original budget resolution. But the final result before us today is still woefully inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, as we send our young men and women to war in Iraq, certain to result in disability for some young Americans, we unfortunately are simultaneously sending the message that Congress is not concerned about their future as veterans! This is unconscionable.

Why does the Republican budget proposal fail to fund veterans programs at the level recommended by the Independent Budget? I am sad that it is largely because Congress is poised to give a tax break to the wealthiest Americans.

Who deserves to receive the benefits of the national treasury—America's disabled veterans or America's millionaires?

I urge my colleagues to reject this budget resolution.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, I find it deeply troubling that as this country prepares for war and unites in support for our troops, the House Republicans would push forward a deeply partisan, environmentally destructive budget, hoping that a nation focused on war abroad will not notice this domestic attack.

This outrageous budget cuts more from crucial environmental programs than even the President's proposals. Without bothering to explain where these cuts will come from, House Republicans slashed more than 10 percent for the 2004 environmental funding, over 3 billion dollars. Incredibly, these cuts continue through the next ten years, providing for less than minimally required to maintain the existing levels of enforcement and environmental protections Americans rely on to protect our health and natural world.

Perhaps most deplorably, this proposed budget dictates our nation's environmental policy for the near future. It is a back-door way to open one of

America's most precious wilderness areas to oil drilling. My Republican colleagues claim that this budget is 'silent' about oil drilling in the Arctic. If this budget is silent, it is certainly not neutral. The \$1.1 billion cut over 10 years will all but force the federal government to use income from oil drilling in ANWR to reconcile deep funding cuts to balance their budget.

While Secretary Norton may think that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is "an area of flat, white nothingness," my constituents understand that the Refuge is an unique, irreplaceable coastal plain and home to more than 100 species of wildlife and birds whose habitat would be undeniably devastated by this reckless drilling. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is a gem of the national wildlife system, created over one hundred years ago by Teddy Roosevelt, and the area of proposed drilling, Area 1002, is the ecological heart of the refuge.

Slipping ANWR 'silently' into this budget is dishonorable procedure and dangerous environmental policy. I urge my colleagues to oppose this handout to big oil companies and to support the Spratt substitute, which will protect an invaluable American treasure.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, You can tell a lot about a family by looking at their checkbook. The same is true of our nation. This budget reflects our priorities by investing in Defense, Homeland Security, the economy, and programs supporting our most vulnerable populations. The number one responsibility of the federal government is to protect American lives.

Under this budget, our military men and women will have the best and most modern equipment, better pay, better housing, and better Veterans Benefits—\$62 billion dollars. That's \$4 billion more than the previous year.

In my district of Jacksonville, the USS *John F. Kennedy* is undergoing an extensive maintenance rehabilitation period. There are many other aging ships within our fleet that require this type of depot level maintenance. This budget provides \$5.3 billion for intermediation and depot level ship maintenance—an additional \$500 million over last year's levels. This budget is a responsible investment in Jacksonville as a national security asset.

Included in the 2004 Military Construction request is \$115.7 million for the acquisition of Blount Island. The Marines operate their maritime pre-positioning force from this location. Sixteen ships loaded with a brigades worth of equipment from light armored vehicles to the Meals Ready to Eat are maintained on a routine basis at this location. The Maritime Pre-positioning Force floats in certain geographical locations around the world to reduce time required to deploy Marine forces. Currently 11 of these 16 ships have off-loaded their Jacksonville maintained equipment in Kuwait for the Marines use in the liberation of Iraq.

Under this budget, the federal government is on a 9-year-track toward balance and we remove tax code obstacles that stand in the way of growing our economy.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this budget resolution, not just because it protects Americans, not just because it restrains spending, not just because it targets waste, fraud, and

abuse, not just because it removes barriers to economic growth . . .

Vote for it because somewhere in my hometown of Jacksonville, there's a family that will sit around their kitchen table tonight, and they will talk about how much money is in the checking account and they will talk about when their bills are due.

They are making responsible decisions and expect nothing less from us.

This budget blueprint will protect that family, it will let that family keep a little more money to pay a bill, buy new clothes, or save for their children's education.

Vote for this budget because it's what's right for America.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the House Budget Committee and Chairman NUSSLE's leadership in crafting a Budget Resolution that epitomizes fiscal discipline and brings important tax relief and job creation to hard working American families. This Resolution will also protect Americans both here and abroad as we continue to face the challenges of the War on Terrorism.

It is too common in this chamber that Members talk about reducing spending, creating jobs, protecting Americans and providing common sense tax relief without a willingness to make the important changes. Unfortunately, rhetoric does not produce results.

This Budget Resolution symbolizes a strong commitment to make the needed reforms in spending that this body has been promising. This resolution is fiscally responsible and outlines a plan to balance the budget in nine years, while bringing important tax relief to American families.

This Resolution calls for a one percent reduction in growth, except for social security, defense, Medicare and Veterans and homeland security funding. By no means is this approach radical. This Budget Resolution allocates \$200 billion over the next 10 years for Medicare with an additional \$400 billion for Medicare modernization and prescription drug coverage. Veterans spending will increase by \$844 million in Fiscal Year 2004. Education, Defense, Homeland Security and many other agencies will receive significant increases under this plan.

A one percent reduction in growth will allow for the elimination of waste, fraud and inefficiencies that consistently plagues federal spending. Locating this abuse is no great challenge for most agency budgets and eliminating it should be our obligation.

The Budget Resolution also provides for sound growth policy that will stimulate our economy, provide jobs to Americans and reduce the tax burden on American families. For example, the budget resolution assumes the 2001 tax cuts are made permanent and accommodates the entire growth plan proposed by President Bush.

President Bush's growth plan is vital to stimulating our weak economy and creating jobs for Americans. This includes the permanent elimination of the marriage penalty tax, the death tax and the double taxation of dividends.

The elimination of the double taxation of dividends, alone, will provide an average of 500,000 jobs a year and will greatly help the 52 percent of Americans—half of which are seniors—that are invested in the stock market.

The President's Growth Plan will also provide job opportunities to unemployed Ameri-

cans throughout the nation. In Florida, alone, 248,500 jobs will be created over the next four years as a direct result to the policies of President Bush's Growth Plan.

Small businesses—the foundation of America's economy—would also receive important tax savings under President's Growth Package. In fact, 23 million small businesses will receive tax cuts averaging \$2,042 under this plan.

Unfortunately, the only plans the Democrats are offering would spend irresponsibly and raise taxes. This is not only an injustice to the American economy, but a great injustice to American families that rely on tax relief during rough economic times.

I came to Congress promising my constituents that I would support tax relief and the concept of fiscal discipline. There is no piece of legislation that outlines a plan that accurately adheres to these principles better than the Budget Resolution we have before us.

Todays vote will clearly indicate who restrains spending and provides tax relief and who only talks about it. I look forward to sending a clear message to America that the days of rhetoric are over—we are going to control spending, provide tax relief to hard-working families and open the door to employment opportunities for millions of Americans.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Majority's fiscal year 2004 Budget Resolution because this resolution is unrealistic in reflecting the spending realities that our nation will face. Never in the history of our country has a Congress or a President dared to reward the wealthiest at a time of recession and war while asking the rest of America for painful sacrifice. If you believe seniors, veterans, and children are the problem, then the Majority has a budget solution for you. This shameful plan cuts funding for nearly every federal program, while at the same time making way for excessive tax cuts that will explode the deficit further and do nothing to help our economy.

This Budget Resolution contains deep and widespread cuts in every basic domestic program except Social Security and military retirement. The budget would require congressional committees to cut mandatory programs by \$470 billion over the next ten years. The cuts are reminiscent of those proposed by former House Speaker Newt Gingrich in 1995 and included in the Contract with America budget legislation that former President Clinton vetoed that year.

While requiring deep cuts in domestic programs, the budget makes room for most for the President's large tax-cut package, including \$1.4 trillion in tax cuts through 2013. The tax cuts in the "growth" package alone would cost \$725 billion over ten years and would, according to the Tax Policy Center, result in tax reductions averaging \$90,000 each in 2003 for those Americans who have incomes of more than \$1 million. Unfortunately, 35 percent of New Mexico taxpayers would get no tax cut at all under the Bush plan, and 53 percent of New Mexico taxpayers would get a cut of less than \$100.

Mr. Chairman, according to official projections by the Congressional Budget Office, budget deficits will turn to surpluses by 2008 if Congress refrains from enacting any further tax cuts or program increases, with the budget running a net surplus of \$0.6 trillion over the period from 2003 through 2013. As is widely

recognized, however, these projections are too optimistic: they do not include the large and inevitable cost of providing relief from the exploding scope of the Alternative Minimum Tax; they include no allowance for a war with Iraq; and they assume that various "temporary" tax credits will expire on schedule even though Congress nearly always extends them. Reflecting the cost of these three omitted items adds approximately \$1 trillion in deficits over ten years.

The most reprehensible component of the House budget, as with its Senate counterpart, is that as the United States has begun "Operation Iraqi Freedom" neither measure sets aside one penny for this war with Iraq. The Bush administration has resolutely refused to offer cost estimates of war or early reconstruction despite requests from those on both sides of the aisle. Leaders in both parties have expressed increasing frustration that the potential bill for war and rebuilding Iraq still remain a mystery.

Mr. Chairman, with nearly a quarter of a million young Americans crossing the Iraqi border this House is on the verge of approving a nightmare budget that sets aside no money for this effort. Instead of sticking our heads in the budgetary sand and ignoring the war's price tag, we need to be honest with American taxpayers and ourselves. To pass a budget plan including large tax cuts without attempting even to estimate the war and postwar reconstruction costs is breathtakingly irresponsible.

I oppose the Majority's Budget Resolution because: It Fails to Promote Economic Growth—Instead of Creating Both Short-Term & Long-Term Economic Growth.

It Fails to Provide a Meaningful Prescription Drug Plan—Instead of Investing in An Affordable Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit, Available to All Seniors.

It Embraces Fiscally Irresponsible Tax Cuts Totaling \$1.35 Trillion—Instead of Embracing Responsible Budgeting.

It Makes Substantial Cuts to National Priorities—like Education and Health Care—Instead of Funding Key National Priorities like the "Leave No Child Behind Act".

It Cuts Veterans' Benefits and Freezes Homeland Security Funding—Instead of Providing For Our Veterans and Giving Our First Responders the Tools they Need to Protect Our Homeland.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier we should be honest with the American taxpayers and with ourselves that the responsible thing to do is not pass this budget until we have the war supplemental figures before us and can reach consensus on other key federal programs.

Mr. STARK. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 975. This bankruptcy bill is touted as reform. But, it is actually a wolf in sheep's clothing intended to allow credit card companies and other lenders to gouge consumers when they are most vulnerable.

Republicans are giving this gift to the big credit card companies in the midst of this difficult recession, making it harder for working families to seek shelter from the common financial emergency of a lost job or lack of health coverage. In fact, 90% of all bankruptcies are filed for these very reasons. It's hard to see the abuse in these real instances of need, especially when many Americans live paycheck to paycheck.

Yet, this Republican legislation makes it more difficult for those Americans forced into

bankruptcy—a disproportionate number whom are women and minorities—to seek this protection. In fact, the bill requires the debtor in some cases to have to take on big corporate lenders in court to prove they are worthy of bankruptcy, forcing them to bear legal expenses they can't afford. In addition, this bill also allows creditors to threaten debtors with costly litigation that will in turn force many families to needlessly give up their legal rights.

In their continuing compassion, the Republicans have crafted this so-called reform so that a parent seeking to collect child support from an estranged spouse that's declared bankruptcy will have to fight it out with creditors to receive payment. Meanwhile, this bill makes it easier for those seeking bankruptcy protection to lose their homes or be evicted by their landlords. Yet, those with million dollar mansions will be able to keep their homes even while seeking the same bankruptcy protection. Nothing like a fair shake for America's working families.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, with all of the perks they've awarded to the big credit card companies, Republicans have done nothing to ensure that they are held accountable. There is nothing in this bill that stops the abusive, predatory lending that lands too many Americans in bankruptcy in the first place.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this anti consumer bill. Now is not the time to turn the tables on America's working families. Vote no on H.R. 975.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the lengths to which my Republican colleagues will go to in order to help out their fat-cat buddies will never cease to amaze me. We are considering a budget resolution today that is so bad and so draconian that the Republican leadership is having trouble convincing some of their own rank and file to support it.

I am outraged, Mr. Chairman, absolutely outraged that at a time when this nation is at war, my Republican colleagues are attempting to cut funding for veterans. Have they no shame? Mr. Speaker, these men and women were willing to risk their lives for this nation and many lost limbs in the process. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would repay these most patriotic of Americans by slashing \$15 billion from the Veteran's Administration budget over the next 10 years. Of course, since 96 percent of the VA's discretionary budget goes to pay for the healthcare of those who served this Nation, this means that we are reducing enrollment, reducing hospital days of care and reducing nursing staff. This is how the Republican leadership gives their thanks to our veterans.

At recent hearings, I expressed skepticism about the President's "budget-neutral" proposal to convert Medicaid to a block grant. Not only would this proposal leave States at risk if Medicaid costs rose, but I warned that it was a prelude to Congressional cuts in the program. The ink was not even dry on the Presi-

dent's proposal before the House Republicans are now requiring \$100 billion cut in the program. As State budgets are being squeezed, the notion of reducing Federal spending on Medicaid is an astonishingly bad idea.

Although our Republican colleagues appear to have backed off their threat to slash Medicare to the bone, no one should be mistaken that this is the last we will hear of it. For years, Republicans have sought to do away with Medicare and Social Security—most recently under the guise of privatization. Medicare and Social Security remain primary targets for Republican ideologues and tax-cutters, and we must remain ever vigilant to protect these vital programs.

Mr. Chairman, this budget also fails to protect the environment. In fact, it cuts FY 04 funding by more than 10 percent. And over the next 10 years, it slashes environmental spending by more than 11 percent. What does this mean? Well, it could mean cuts for clean water, which is a logical choice since the Bush Administration seems hell bent on dismantling the Clean Water Act and selling off our rivers to hydroelectric companies. It likely means cuts for brownfields redevelopment. Of course, my Republican colleagues try to soften this blow by opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling, which they say will increase federal receipts by \$2.1 billion over the next 10 years. I am not certain how my friends on the other side of the aisle intend to do this, since some cooler heads in the Senate stripped the ANWR provision out of their budget yesterday.

Just two years ago, President Bush signed into law the No Child Left Behind Act, which was lauded by Democrats and Republicans alike. At the time that the bill was signed, the President and Congressional Republicans made a commitment to American families and their children that the programs in that bill would be funded at proper levels so that our public schools would not be placed in financial straight jackets. For two years that promise has gone unfulfilled, and this budget not only continues that dangerous trend, but actually cuts education funding. Mr. Speaker, Congressional Republicans have gone even further in their cuts than the President did in his budget, slashing spending by 8 percent. Let me give you a specific, Mr. Speaker. If this budget passes, more than 22,000 kids in my home state of Michigan will quite literally be left out in the cold. These kids will be left without any after-school services. Let me ask, is this what compassionate conservatism is all about?

Mr. Chairman, the cuts don't stop there. This sham of a budget drastically cuts our agriculture programs. Our farmers are the lifeblood of this great Nation. How do we show them our support? Well, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle thank our farmers by slashing agriculture programs by \$763 million in FY 04. What this means in real terms is that conservation, nutrition, rural development and producer payment programs would be cut by

more than 25 percent over their authorized amounts. These draconian cuts are neither justified nor sustainable. Again, that is not the end of the agriculture cuts. The Republican budget requires that the Agriculture Committee cut nearly \$20 billion in direct spending over the next 10 years. This means more cuts to our family farmers by slashing funding to farm loan programs, conservation programs, rural development, forestry and research.

All of this leads to a very logical question, Mr. Speaker: why are my Republican colleagues doing this? Why are they gutting programs that help America's working families? Well, Mr. Speaker, they are doing this to accommodate more tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. Yes, the goal of this budget is to allow the President to push through more of his irresponsible tax cuts. Make no mistake: these tax cuts will not stimulate the economy and will not help middle class Americans. In fact, in my home state of Michigan, about 50 percent of taxpayers would get less than \$100 under the President's plan, and 30 percent would get no tax cut at all. Of course, this all leaves open the possibility that local communities will have to raise taxes because my Republican colleagues expect them to bear the burden of homeland security costs. This rascality is just another ploy for my Republican colleagues to help out their fat-cat corporate friends and leave the American people out in the cold.

Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I neglected to mention the cost of this current war with Iraq. We don't know how much the war will cost, and we have no idea how much it will cost to rebuild Iraq after the war. The Republican budget does not include one penny to pay for our troops currently overseas or the costs of reconstructing Iraq. Mr. Speaker, is this really the time to be centering the entire budget around tax cuts? I think not. This is a sham and an outrage.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget provides members with a reasonable and responsible alternative and I would strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it. Our budget is centered around a stimulus plan that provides both long term and short term economic growth—creating 1 million new jobs this year alone. The Democratic budget is responsible, balancing the budget by 2010 without unrealistic spending cuts. The Democratic budget gives schools the funding they need to implement No Child Left Behind, and more importantly, the funding they need to properly prepare our kids for the future. The Democratic budget provides \$32 billion over the next 10 years for Veterans healthcare. Mr. Speaker, making sure those who were willing to give their lives for this country are taken care of needs to be a priority. It is, quite simply, the right thing to do. At this time of war, the Democratic budget adequately invests in Homeland Security by providing \$32 billion

more than Republicans over the next 10 years—ensuring \$3.5 billion in desperately needed new money for first responders. The Democratic budget also provides an adequate prescription drug benefit so our senior citizens don't have to choose between groceries and filling a prescription.

I would ask my colleagues, all of my colleagues, to reject the Republican budget and support the Democratic substitute.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, as we are now unfortunately engaged in an assault on Iraq, I pray for the safety of our American servicemen and women engaged in that military campaign and hope for their safe return. As we debate this budget resolution to fund programs for the defense and investment in our country I am very troubled by the harmful consequences for the budget cuts called for in this document.

This budget resolution partially reflects our current priority to protect the men and women of our fighting forces. It is only a partial measure because we need to see the supplemental appropriations request before we really know what the defense budget is. Looking beyond defense, this resolution is a travesty to the Americans who live within these borders.

High priority programs like Medicaid, education, veterans benefits, federal employee pension benefits, prescription drug benefits, law enforcement, food stamps are targeted under this budget resolution.

The majority says the cut backs total represent a 1 percent across-the-board cut. But because the Republican budget mirrors the President's request for defense, they impose a 2.9 percent cut on nondefense spending.

This is a guns and caviar budget.

The budget resolution says these cuts will come from eliminating waste, fraud and abuse. That's hogwash; it cannot be found. The resolution instructs the authorizing Committees to do the dirty work. The Committees will be asked to pony up \$470 billion in direct spending program cuts over 10 years. When measured against a 10-year mandatory spending projection of \$15.6 trillion that amounts to a 3 percent cut.

The only way to accommodate a cut of this magnitude is to cut benefit levels or restrict eligibility for benefits for human service programs that service our children, elderly, veterans, farmers, federal workers and more.

This budget could push nearly half a million poor children out of child nutrition programs.

In the field of health care, the Republican budget does not provide any significant funding for a Medicare Prescription Drug Program—only \$28 billion. With that, you might be able to provide every senior with a bottle or two of aspirin each year.

The Resolution doesn't tell Congress to specifically cut funding for Medicare and Medicaid in order to provide a prescription drug program. It tells the Ways and Means and the Energy and Commerce Committees to do the dirty work. So if the Republicans want to deliver on their promise of a \$400 billion prescription drug program, the two committees will have to find a combined total of \$372 billion in program cuts.

Under this budget resolution seniors lose out in two ways. They get little or no prescription drug benefit and they will see their coverage under Medicare and Medicaid reduced. They will lose out because here are the options available for getting to the numbers called for in the Republican budget resolution:

Cut physician reimbursement by a third, saving \$215 billion. If we go that route, it will only encourage doctors to stop seeing Medicare and Medicaid patients.

Eliminate hospital payments for medical education and cost of uncompensated care, saving \$200 billion. That will be devastating to urban hospitals in Detroit and other inner cities, which are on the brink of financial collapse as it is.

Terminate home health benefits under Medicare. That will yield \$207 billion. Or do away with skilled nursing home benefits . . . that will save \$187 billion.

We can save \$51 billion by taking health care services away from 5.3 million low income kids under the State Children Health Insurance Program.

This is a resolution that says to the wealthy, you don't have to pay the cost of this war against Iraq. We'll give the bill to seniors, children, disabled Americans, the sick, the hungry and to generations not yet born. There is no sacrifice being asked of those who can afford it the most. Make no mistake about it. The \$382 billion dividend tax cut will do nothing to stimulate the economy. It most benefits those who financially benefit the most in our society.

And that's not just my view. It's a view point shared by the Disabled American Veterans. Ed Heath, National Commander of the DAV, says—and I quote—"Cutting already under funded veterans' programs to offset the costs of tax cuts is undefensible and callous."

I have been critical of the President's budget and foreign policies. Why, after all, are we conducting a war that we are not willing to pay for. The President is sending a message that we can extend our global military reach without any sacrifice and still afford a tax cut that will largely benefit the top one percent of Americans. This budget document echoes what the Administration has been saying: "We can have it all."

Well, we can't have it all if it means breaking a contract with federal workers by cutting their pension health benefits;

if it means breaking the contract that we have with our seniors to cut back on Medicaid and Medicare health coverage;

if it means reneging on a promise to provide seniors with a meaningful prescription drug benefit;

if it turns our back on disability benefits and health care for our veterans;

if it means denying opportunities to our children by cutting back on health programs, Head Start, and Pell Grants.

This budget resolution is nothing but a series of broken promises. All the alternatives being considered today represent a better way, and I am going to support them. With an America at war, we need to act with some fiscal responsibility. The Republican budget does not meet that test. This budget benefits the investment class with a dividend tax cut at the expense of programs that serve everyday Americans. It divides us as a country and worsens our economic position.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very reluctant support of H. Con. Res. 95 because I believe that the cuts contained in the budget resolution, particularly as they relate to healthcare and veterans issues, will have dire consequences for a substantial portion of our nation. However, I will support the budget resolution today to ensure that this process moves forward. I know that last year Congress

was unable to pass a budget resolution, and it greatly harmed our ability to move forward and to the work of the American people. It's critical that the House move the budget process forward, with the hope that the Senate will do its share and also pass a budget, which will trigger a conference. It is my hope that after today we will be one step closer to creating a fairer budget that maintains fiscal discipline while still meeting the needs of our constituents.

As a four-year veterans, I have always worked hard to be a vocal advocate for veterans throughout my congressional career. I strongly oppose the provisions in H. Con. Res. 95 that call for approximately \$15 billion in mandatory spending programs for veterans. These programs include compensation for service-connected disabilities, survivor benefits and veterans' education benefits. I do not believe that forced budgetary reductions in these important mandatory spending programs are in the best interest of disabled veterans and their families.

While I will vote in favor of H. Con. Res. 95 in order to get the bill into conference with the Senate, I want to make it perfectly clear that I will not support the conference report on the budget resolution or any deeming resolution if it contains these or similar reductions in veterans' mandatory spending and does not provide sufficient funding for veterans' health care programs. Nor will I support the conference report if it contains significant reductions in Medicare funding. Moreover, if the conference report contains these types of reduction, I will do everything in my power to overturn them.

What kind of message are we sending to the men and women currently serving in our Armed Forces, especially those in Iraq, when we cut funding for programs that benefit our nation's current veterans? I want to remind my colleagues of a quote by our first Commander-in-Chief George Washington: "The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their nation." We must support the brave men and women who have sacrificed so much to keep our nation free.

The Medicaid cuts contained in this budget can not be sustained. The cuts will seriously damage a program depended upon by our most vulnerable citizens. Waste, fraud, and abuse, particularly abuse, do exist but we must have time to excise these problems, without being forced into mandatory programmatic reductions. Also, we must realize that each of our States will be particularly hit hard by these cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I do believe that we can strike a balance that will provide tax relief to American families, fund our national priorities, while still achieving a balanced budget. I refuse, however, to do so on the backs of some of our nation's most vulnerable citizens; and I declare that I will consider myself bound by this resolution should the House and Senate fail to pass a joint budget resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as war begins in Iraq, Americans are rallying behind our Armed Forces. It is an extraordinary show of support for some of the finest men and women in America. They deserve our support and our gratitude.

Our soldiers confront the gravest threat of our time: the combination of rogue regimes, weapons of mass destruction and the forces of global terrorism. The cause of peace will prevail when terrorists lose a wealthy patron and protector—Saddam Hussein.

There is little doubt that Hussein will be fully disarmed. And the means of his disarmament will be carried out by the United States Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines. These are four institutions so identified with their commitment to honor, duty and country that words can never adequately convey their importance to the survival of freedom . . . to the survival of the United States of America.

On the eve of the war, Marine Major-General J.N. Mattis explained the mission to his Corps. They are words every American soldier in the Persian Gulf can embrace.

General Mattis said:

On your young shoulders rest the hopes of mankind. . . . Our fight is not with the Iraqi people, nor is it with members of the Iraqi army who chose to surrender. While we will move swiftly and aggressively against those who resist, we will treat all others with decency, demonstrating chivalry and soldierly compassion for people who have endured a lifetime under Saddam's oppression. . . .

For the mission's sake, our country's sake, and the sake of the men who carried the Division's colors in past battle—who fought for life and never lost their nerve—carry out your mission and keep your honor clean. Demonstrate to the world there is "No Better Friend, No Worse Enemy" than a U.S. Marine.

General Mattis deserves an enduring "Semper Paratus" for inspiring our soldiers. We hope and pray for their safe return home.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have four priorities for this budget; creating an environment for job creation, providing for the common defense, making quality health care more affordable, and improving education. I also want all these things must be done in a way that gets us back to a balanced budget within a reasonable period of time. The resolution we will pass tonight is tough medicine and doesn't do all it needs to do.

I believe that this budget will create jobs and stimulate the economy. By leaving room for significant tax relief we can leave extra dollars in the pockets of millions of Americans. I support tax relief, particularly for small businesses that create jobs and I applaud the chairman for his work.

During this time of war, this budget does a great job funding our national defense, both military spending and homeland security. This budget goes a long way toward making all Americans more secure. I am very concerned that even with the manager's changes, it sorely under funds our veterans programs.

Inroads have been made so this budget begins to address issues regarding the affordability of Health Care. When this budget was introduced it had spending levels in Medicare that were unworkable. Because of these cuts, I felt it necessary to introduce my own amendment that was not accepted by the House Rules Committee to provide more than \$375 billion additional dollars for Medicare and other Health programs over the next 10 years. Changes made in the Medicare accounts since its introduction have relieved many of my concerns. I hope that the conference re-

port will completely fix the funding of healthcare as it relates to Medicaid.

The most difficult part of this budget for me to accept is the lack of commitment to education. Just last year we passed the landmark legislation, "No Child Left Behind." I feel that this budget does not meet the promises we made in that legislation. The amendment that I proposed would have increased the budget authority on education by more than \$70 billion over 10 years. I urge the conferees to renew our commitment to education and fund education at least to the President's level.

I will vote for this budget, but my support comes cautiously. Last year we didn't have a budget and it created great difficulty in getting the appropriations done. We need to move this process forward building on the progress we have made in the last twenty-four hours. While I will support this budget today, I will not support a conference report that does not adequately support our veterans, keep our promises on education, create jobs, and improve our Nation's health system. I ask that the conferees make these important improvements before our final vote on this budget later this year.

Ms. MAJETTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to explain why I voted for those budget alternatives I supported today. The passage of the budget resolution to day represents the culmination of a long and arduous process involving 435 members of Congress and their often divergent views and priorities. As each member of Congress represents a unique constituency, each with its own concerns, it is entirely fitting that alternatives be considered and debated before the final federal budget is passed by this body.

This budget outlines the manner in which our shared national resources will be allocated for the year, and, as such, the resolution must be a statement of both our immediate needs as well as our long-term priorities. Consequently, the budget process requires each of us to make tough choices when deciding how much to burden American families with taxes as well as how to allocate these limited resources to different categories of needs.

The budget process often results in choices between imperfect alternatives that do not necessarily completely reflect any one member's priorities. In deciding which alternative to support, I balanced two primary priorities: my ardent desire to limit our spending's impact on the future, and my sincere belief that spending should be focused on programs that provide real investments in the future.

To realize our long term goals, we ought to minimize our long-term debts. In doing so, we will allow our children to pay for their dreams without being saddled with our realities.

I would like to bequeath to our children a world where we have tackled the problems of our day and provided them unfettered access to the tools they'll need tomorrow. If we are determined to spend our precious resources now (rather than saving them for our children's use) it is reasonable that we devote a large portion of these resources to the betterment of our children's future.

Perhaps the most future-oriented use of a taxpayer's money is to invest in exploration of our world through research. Scientific inquiry, by its very nature, offers no guarantees; the paths of discovery are rife with pitfalls and

stumbles. As the explosion of the Columbia tragically reminded us, exploring the unknown is never easy. It is often painful. In the end, however, scientific inquiry offers us our best hope that the world can be a better place.

Through government assistance, some of the greatest minds of our time are working to find cures for the disease that plague us, young and old, rich and poor alike. Failing to fund these initiatives robs our children of their hopes for a better world. One day in the future, these scientists will discover a cure for cancer, a vaccine for AIDS, and a better method for reaching further into the galaxy. We must continue to make their efforts a priority—they are exploring for all of us.

As we consider our nation's priorities, we must be absolutely certain that we fully fund education initiatives. Education is the ultimate mechanism for allowing social mobility by leveling the playing field of opportunity. The United States continues to be a beacon of hope for other nations as a place where anyone, regardless of socioeconomic background, race or parentage, is limited only by his or her dreams; a place where everyone can achieve their goals. Our promise as a nation rests on maintaining this ideal. As Thomas Jefferson once stated, "If the condition of man is to be progressively ameliorated, as we fondly hope and believe, education is to be the chief instrument in effecting it."

My preference today was to vote for a budget that is both fiscally responsible and that focuses the Public's resources on those programs for which we can expect the greatest return on our investment. After considering the alternatives, I voted in favor of more than one alternative.

The Blue-Dog budget provides a fiscally responsible alternative. As presented, this plan would have reduced the national debt by \$1.35 trillion, compared to the budget which passed. This reduction would have resulted in \$250 billion less in taxes that our children would have to pay simply to pay the interest on this debt. While limiting the debt burden on our children, this alternative would also have cut taxes and focused resources to educational investments including student-loan and child nutrition programs.

The budget committee's ranking member, Mr. SPRATT, offered a budget which is a powerful statement of priorities and would have continued to fund our nation's important commitments to job creation, social security and medicare. This budget would have ensured that education and science programs be allocated the necessary funding to ensure that our nation continues to be a leader in the information age. It also would have allowed our children to meet the challenges of the future with the resources necessary to face them.

Through none of the budget alternatives I supported passed, I look forward to working with my colleagues to continue to establish our priorities in the weeks and months ahead. It is crucial that as we do so we remember where we are going. IF we are truly committed to social equality and to leaving no child behind, we must provide our children with the tools necessary to create an even better world

than the entirely too dangerous one in which we now find ourselves. If we endeavor to better understand our world through research, we give hope to our children that they will not be afflicted by the ailments that we suffer today and we give them the legacy of vision to look beyond that which is not imaginable. Finally, we must not bind our children with debt if we hope to allow them to rise above our own accomplishments.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 95 because it fails to meet the challenges confronting our country. We need a balanced approach to fiscal responsibility that treats the national budget just like a household budget.

America is going through very trying times. The economy is struggling unemployment is up, consumer confidence is down and our Armed Forces are at war. H. Con. Res. 95 fails to address these concerns because it embraces an inflated and fiscally irresponsible tax cut plan totaling \$1.4 trillion. These tax cuts accommodate all of President Bush's proposals, but they would not provide the stimulus we need to jumpstart our economy. However, including all of them in this budget force us to make deep cuts in heavily relied upon programs.

I cannot go home and tell my constituents that I cut after-school programs, student loans, teacher quality programs, and COPS funding to make room for inflated tax cut plan that has no immediate impact on our economy.

I also cannot go home and tell my constituents that I slashed \$265 billion in mandatory spending, placed an increased burden upon cash-strapped States, reduced investments in highway construction, and only partially funded programs under the No Child Left Behind Act so we can make room for a back-loaded tax plan that crowds out important programs.

And don't forget our ongoing war in Iraq. There is not one penny in this proposal that budgets for the war or the cost of rebuilding the economy.

Some argue we can address these costs in a supplemental. However, supplementals are becoming more like 2nd budgets. If we have an idea of what something is going to cost, we should budget accordingly for it now. We should not be playing games with the numbers.

This body should pass a budget that: Puts us back in balance; provides a tax stimulus that actually stimulates; secures our Homeland; offers a sensible prescription drug proposal; and sufficiently funds our military.

Although I understand the need to make sacrifices if we want to jumpstart the economy, they shouldn't be made by passing bad policy.

That is why I supported Democratic substitute. This budget projects a balanced budget in FY 2010, but does so with \$500 billion less public debt than the committee-reported resolution. Unlike the resolution, the substitute does not cut domestic discretionary spending below the level needed to keep pace with inflation and does not contain any cuts in mandatory spending. Furthermore, the substitute provides a tax stimulus proposal that stimulates now.

Another important contrast is the prescription drug provisions contained in each budget proposal. The Democratic substitute provides \$528 billion in new funds over 10 years for a prescription drug benefit. The resolution, by

contrast, establishes a \$400 billion "reserve fund" for Medicare prescription drugs and Medicare modernization. Why create a reserve fund instead of budgeting for a prescription drug proposal today?

Reserve funds do not solve the problems confronting this country. We need specific budget allocations for specific problems. Generally addressing problems at a later time in a reserve fund simply dances around the issue.

I want to support a budget that actually stimulates while taking into consideration long-term budget implications. There is no room for political gamesmanship when people lose their retirement savings, or their jobs.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 95. I do so reluctantly.

I respect the President.

I admire the Speaker more than I can say.

I think JIM NUSSLE has done an extraordinary job under impossible conditions.

But I am going to oppose the Nussle bill because I think it moves us in the wrong direction.

There are strong arguments against my position, such as: This is only a step in a long process; the conference report is where the real vote is cast; and we must be loyal to the President and to the troops overseas.

But, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that being loyal to the President or our troops in the Persian Gulf—or for that matter to all the other citizens—is really an issue here.

This is a democratic process with which we work—and I know there are party pressures, and I know we need a budget—but this particular budget is not particularly helpful in solving our problems.

At the very least I feel that we should wait until the President submits his "supplemental" request—based on what he feels the military will need. This will be, I assume, a rather large number.

Also the issue of timing is critical. The expense budget which we will vote on is inherently tied to the tax reduction program. This scares me. Together the numbers are not right—the timing is bad. I ask myself—

How can we vote to adversely impact medical and education expenses in a war atmosphere?

How can we see our revenues collapsing in front of us and then consider a tax reduction bill which, while somewhat stimulating to our economy, will further deplete revenues?

For me this package, I'm sorry to say, doesn't hang together.

I just think we can do better.

I hope we can do better—so that I can soon vote for a program which does right by us as a country long term, stimulates our economy short term—and keeps faith with the families of our troops in the Persian Gulf.

Mrs. BROWN of Florida. This irresponsible Republican budget needs to be sent back to the drawing board. The war in Iraq is no reason to ignore the needs of this country. This budget cuts programs for our neediest citizens, while rewarding the wealthiest with huge tax cuts. It is particularly disturbing that at the very moment we send our young men and women into harms way, we fund the veterans budget at a level that keeps these national heroes waiting 12 months to see a doctor. This Congress can always seem to find plenty of money for tax cuts, but when it comes to veterans healthcare, we have nothing but lip service.

This Republican budget is bad for America, and bad for my home State of Florida which is suffering badly from the one-two punch of the Bush Brothers. The President's budget:

Cuts \$20 million for After School Programs in Florida; cuts \$3.7 million in Teacher Quality Funding for Florida; cuts \$40 million in transportation funding for Florida; cuts \$38 million from Election Reform efforts in Florida; cuts \$16.5 million in Clean Water Funding for Florida; cuts \$4.3 million from Community Service Block Grants in Florida; cuts \$1.2 million in Energy Assistance Programs; and cuts \$765 million for the COPS program, which put 7,280 new officers on Florida's streets.

All this while his brother Governor Jeb Bush slashes funding for state education and health programs, squeezes Medicaid resources to pay for Capital Gains Tax Cuts, and uses money meant for Local First Responders to pad his budget shortfalls.

This Republican budget was written for their political contributions, and not for the people of this country with real needs. Reject this sham budget, and support the CBC/Progressive budget. It's the right budget for every American.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, it is with great regret that I voted to support the fiscal year 2004 House Budget Resolution. I did so because I appreciate the value of moving the process along towards a Concurrent Resolution with the Senate. I will not vote for a final Concurrent Budget Resolution that contains the same levels of funding as the House Budget Resolution.

It is my full expectation the cuts to Medicaid and Veterans programs will be restored in the final Concurrent Resolution. It is my intention to support a final Resolution that makes these programs whole again. New York hospitals face a Medicaid cut of \$1 billion from New York State. It would be unthinkable for my hospitals to face a deep cut on the federal level at the same time. They have survived the 1997 Balance Budget Agreement cuts, but can stand no more. One of the hospitals in my district is already scheduled to close and I simply can't afford to lose another one.

I support the goal of a balanced budget and have even cosponsored the Balanced Budget Act, but a balance is just that: matching the merits on both sides. Indeed there is some waste in the current programs and it is time for everyone to do some belt tightening, but the current cuts cannot stand.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises to express his reluctant and temporary support for H. Con. Res. 95, the House Budget Resolution.

Mr. Chairman, our country is facing a difficult fiscal situation and this budget resolution sets a framework for this Congress to carefully proceed over the next ten years. While the budget resolution reserves revenue to finance the full range of the tax cuts proposed by the President, this Member adamantly believes the proposed tax cut is too large and, in fact, this Member will not vote for such a large tax cut when the House separately votes on that issue.

There are three reasons this Member is opposed to this large tax cut. First, it is fiscally irresponsible. Second, in the economic sense, eliminating the tax on dividends is not the best

way to quickly and effectively stimulate the economy. Tax cuts for middle-income Americans and small businesses is far more effective, and eliminating the tax on dividends may in fact drain money from capital goods to dividends for the corporate leaders' pocketbooks through their large stock holdings in their company. And third, the elimination of the tax on dividends as a major part of this tax cut package is not equitable, because a very high percentage of tax relief would go to a small percentage of taxpayers.

The elimination or substantial reduction of the tax on dividends, which results in an estimated reduction in tax revenue of more than an estimated \$100 billion per year, is simply not sound fiscal policy—especially given the estimated size of the deficit, the unknown costs of the war in Iraq, the war on terrorism, and the costs of homeland security measures.

If the budget protects Medicare from huge cuts, as it must, and increases even more the revenues for veterans programs, it would cause impossibly large cuts in the rest of the discretionary budget. This cut in the remainder of the domestic programs required by this budget proposal is too severe even when the savings from the elimination of waste, fraud and abuse is taken into account.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to do what the other body is considering—responsibly cut back the size of the huge tax cut. It is this Member's hope that the conference agreement on the budget will follow the Senate's lead and decrease the funds held in reserve to finance a tax cut. If the conference report comes back to the House with the same fiscally unsound level of tax cuts and substantially the same level of tax cuts related to eliminating the tax on dividends, this Member will vote "no" on the conference report. It is fiscally irresponsible and inequitable to middle-income taxpayers, and the proposal to eliminate taxes on dividends will not give us the immediate economic stimulation our country needs.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, this Member votes "aye" on this budget proposal in order to move the process along. As we learned from last year's inaction on the budget by the other body, the passage of a budget resolution is critically important as the first step in the annual appropriations process that funds the U.S. Government and provides invaluable services to our constituents. As a result, this Member cannot in good conscience vote to stop or stall the process at this early stage. However, be assured that this Member will follow-up on his commitment to vote "no" on the conference report if the level of tax cuts is not decreased and the huge amount dedicated to eliminating the tax on dividends is not dropped or very substantially reduced.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly to support the budget resolution before us today. While the budget before us makes great strides to control spending and reduce the deficit, I am afraid the Veterans Administration will not have the necessary resources to take care of our nation's veterans. I know that many of my Virginia congressional colleagues share these same concerns as well.

While I fully recognize that no budget is perfect, I hope we can all agree that providing health care to our nation's veterans should be the last place we look to reduce spending. Perhaps it would be more appropriate for us to review our spending on foreign aid before we

ask our veterans to sacrifice yet again for their country. At a time when our country has soldiers deployed in Iraq in defense of freedom, it is important that we do not leave behind the men and women who have served our country in the past.

I will vote for this budget, however, because I believe it is vital that we keep the budget process moving. Further delaying the budget could negatively impact defense, homeland security, and other important government functions. As we all know, by failing to pass a budget resolution last year, the Senate caused a train wreck in the appropriations process. The House and the Senate never agreed on a common budget, which left the respective appropriations committees working from two different, irreconcilable sets of numbers. That resulted in Congress working on appropriations bills in January—bills that should have been completed last September. With America now at war, we cannot allow that to happen again.

It is my hope that the final product will be improved, so that I will be able to support the final budget conference report.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget resolution. There are many reasons to oppose this budget, but I am going to concentrate on just one.

This resolution quite simply pays for tax cuts that benefit the wealthy by cutting programs for seniors and disabled people who are most in need of help in meeting their medical expenses.

The original version of this resolution was quite explicit: it required massive cuts in both the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Facing an uproar from beneficiaries and providers alike, what have our Republican colleagues done. They have responded by concentrating all of the cuts on Medicaid, the program that serves the neediest seniors and disabled beneficiaries, as well as millions of poor children.

They think they can fool people by doing this. But millions of America's seniors—widows living on Social Security, people in nursing homes, seniors living on modest budgets—are totally dependent on the additional assistance they get from Medicaid so Medicare can work for them. They know what these cuts mean. They need the help they get with their Medicare premiums and cost-sharing. They need Medicaid coverage of prescription drugs.

And they know that Medicaid is the only source of payment for long-term care services—both nursing home care and home and community based services. It is Medicaid payments that nursing homes rely on—to pay staff, to maintain quality, to provide services.

Medicaid is a critical payer for hospitals, community health centers, clinics and providers that serve the disabled, the low-income, the uninsured, and seniors.

Two-thirds of the dollars we spend in Medicaid go to seniors and disabled people, the very same population served by Medicare. These beneficiaries need both programs. And we all know our States are in desperate need of additional funds to maintain Medicaid coverage and services.

This budget responds to this crisis by slashing Medicaid instead of helping, by turning our backs on millions of disabled people, kids, and low-income seniors instead of assisting them.

This budget responds with a proposed cut in Medicaid twice as big as any reduction made by any previous Congress.

The Republicans have responded to the charge that they were financing their tax cuts on the backs of seniors and the disabled by financing them on the backs of the POOR seniors and disabled.

This budget will cripple our States, it will add to the numbers of uninsured, and it will be devastating for millions of Medicare beneficiaries who need extra help.

If the majority passes this budget, it will show the true colors of the Republican party. It will show a lack of caring for the most vulnerable of our seniors, for the disabled, for poor kids and their moms, for the institutions in this country who try to deliver health care to them, and to the States that are struggling to provide for them.

We should defeat this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). All time for debate having expired, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. ISAKSON, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013, pursuant to House Resolution 151, he reported the concurrent resolution, as amended by the adoption of that resolution, back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on House Concurrent Resolution 95, the budget resolution, will be followed by a 5-minute vote on House Current Resolution 104 regarding Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 212, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—215

Aderholt	Bono	Coble
Akin	Boozman	Cole
Bachus	Bradley (NH)	Collins
Baker	Brady (TX)	Combest
Ballenger	Brown (SC)	Cox
Barrett (SC)	Brown-Waite,	Crane
Barton (TX)	Ginny	Crenshaw
Bass	Burgess	Cubin
Beauprez	Burns	Culberson
Bereuter	Burr	Cunningham
Biggert	Burton (IN)	Davis, Jo Ann
Bilirakis	Calvert	Davis, Tom
Bishop (UT)	Camp	Deal (GA)
Blackburn	Cannon	DeLay
Blunt	Cantor	DeMint
Boehrlert	Capito	Diaz-Balart, L.
Boehner	Carter	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bonilla	Chabot	Doolittle
Bonner	Chocola	Dreier

Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller

Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pommo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad

NAYS—212

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Castle
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)

Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hofstadter
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel

Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Soudier
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Menendez
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy

Buyer
Gordon
Lipinski

NOT VOTING—8

Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis

□ 0254

Mr. COMBEST and Mr. HALL of Texas changed their votes from “nay” to “yea.”

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT AND APPRECIATION FOR THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES PARTICIPATING IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The pending business is the question of agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 104, on which further proceedings were postponed.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 11, answered “present” 22, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra

Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggett
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell

Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin

Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth

Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy

Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pommo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Soudier
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher

Tauzin	Udall (NM)	Weller
Taylor (MS)	Upton	Wexler
Taylor (NC)	Van Hollen	Whitfield
Terry	Velazquez	Wicker
Thomas	Visclosky	Wilson (NM)
Thompson (CA)	Vitter	Wilson (SC)
Thompson (MS)	Walden (OR)	Wolf
Tiahrt	Walsh	Woolsey
Tiberi	Wamp	Wu
Tierney	Waxman	Wynn
Toomey	Weiner	Young (AK)
Turner (OH)	Weldon (FL)	Young (FL)
Turner (TX)	Weldon (PA)	

NAYS—11

Conyers	McDermott	Towns
Honda	Rangel	Waters
Jones (OH)	Scott (VA)	Watson
Lee	Stark	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—22

Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)	Owens
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Paul
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Payne
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Cummings	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Watt
Farr	Meeks (NY)	

NOT VOTING—10

Buyer	McCarthy (MO)	Thornberry
Gordon	Rogers (MI)	Udall (CO)
Lantos	Saxton	
Lipinski	Snyder	

□ 0302

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING H.R. 1104, CHILD ABDUCTION PREVENTION ACT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of March 24 to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 1104, the Child Abduction Prevention Act of 2003.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and 1 copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in Room H-312 of the Capitol by noon on Tuesday, March 25, 2003. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary on March 18, 2003, which is expected to be filed on Tuesday, March 25, 2003.

Members are also advised that the text should be available for their review on the Websites of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules by Friday, March 21, 2003.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate form. Members also should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the balance of the week and next week.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader who worked just a little too hard tonight.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I no longer have to whip these folks like the gentleman does, and our whip was really working hard tonight and did a great job.

I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland yielding to me, Mr. Speaker.

If the gentleman would continue to yield, the House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those bills will be sent to Members' offices early next week. Any votes called on these bills will be rolled until 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday.

On Wednesday, we expect to consider several additional bills under suspension of the rules before moving to legislation to create a compensation fund for first responders who receive the smallpox vaccine. While this legislation has not yet been introduced, I tell my friend from Maryland the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Education and the Workforce have been working diligently to arrive at a compromise that I believe all Members will be able to support.

On Thursday, we will consider two bills addressing child abuse, as we head into April, which is designated as Child Abuse Prevention Month. H.R. 1104, the Child Abduction Prevention Act, would extend the Justice Department's Amber Alert system to a nationwide program. It also eliminates the statute of limitations for child abduction and sex crimes, prohibits pretrial release in cases of rape and child kidnapping, provides for a mandatory minimum sentence for child kidnapping, and establishes a two strikes and you are out requirement for child sex offenders.

H.R. 14, the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act, will reauthorize and modify the Child Abuse Prevention Treatment Act and related programs to prevent child abuse and family violence, and to protect and treat abused and neglected children and victims of family violence.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I will be happy to answer any of his questions.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished leader for that information.

First, Mr. Leader, I presume we have concluded all of our work this week; is that correct?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is correct. I failed to say that we have completed the work of the House for the week and will not return until Tuesday.

Mr. HOYER. I know all the Members thank the gentleman for that information.

I will ask the gentleman, next Friday, does the gentleman expect to be in session next Friday, or could the Members expect not to be in session next Friday?

Mr. DELAY. No, we do not expect to be in session on next Friday.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

Does the gentleman anticipate that the tax bill will be marked up by the Committee on Ways and Means next week, and then can we anticipate it on the floor the following week?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would continue to yield, the Committee on Ways and Means, as the gentleman knows, has held a series of hearings on various components of the President's economic growth package. Now that the House has passed the budget resolution, I expect that the committee will move forward very soon in this important legislation, and I would certainly like to have it considered by the House before the Easter recess.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talked about the committees, but the energy bill, when can we expect the full committee to take action on that bill, and when does the gentleman expect it to come to the floor?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would continue to yield, as the distinguished minority whip knows, the proposal that the House passed in the last Congress had provisions from more than half a dozen committees. We are again working to coordinate the work of various committees to ensure that we can quickly get a bill through the House. At least one committee began the markup process for that bill last week, and I know the others are moving forward as fast as they can, and many of them are marking up next week. I would hope that all the committees involved in this important legislation on energy would complete their work in time so that we can have the bill on the floor prior to the Easter recess.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and, Mr. Speaker, I have no further questions of the leader, and I appreciate his giving us the schedule.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 24, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, March 24, 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 24, that it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday,

March 25, 2003, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONFISCATING AND VESTING CERTAIN IRAQI PROPERTY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-51)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b) (IEEPA), and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1631, I hereby report that I have taken additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12722 of August 2, 1990, by exercising my statutory authority to confiscate and vest certain property of the Government of Iraq and its agencies, instrumentalities, or controlled entities.

Consistent with section 203(a)(1)(C) of IEEPA, 50 U.S.C. 1702(a)(1)(C), as added by section 106 of the USA PATRIOT ACT, Public Law 107-56, I have ordered that certain blocked funds held in the United States in accounts in the name of the Government of Iraq, the Central Bank of Iraq, Rafidain Bank, Rasheed Bank, or the State Organization for Marketing Oil are hereby confiscated and vested in the Department of the Treasury. I have made exceptions for any such funds that are subject to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations or the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, or that enjoy equivalent privileges and immunities under the laws of the United States, and are or have been used for diplomatic or consular purposes. In addition, such amounts that, as of the date of the order, are subject to post-judgment writs of execution or attachment in aid of execution of judgments pursuant to section 201 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-297) are not being vested, provided that, upon satisfaction of the judgments on which such writs are based,

any remainder of such excepted amounts shall, without further action, be confiscated and vested.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury authority to undertake all other action of the President and all functions of the President set forth in section 203(a)(1)(C) of IEEPA with respect to any and all property of the Government of Iraq, including its agencies, instrumentalities, or controlled entities, and to take additional steps, including the promulgation of rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued, which is effective immediately.

I have exercised these authorities in furtherance of Executive Orders 12722 and 12724 with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to our national security and foreign policy posed by the policies and actions of the Government of Iraq. I intend that such vested property should be used to assist the Iraqi people and to assist in the reconstruction of Iraq, and have determined that such use would be in the interest of and for the benefit of the United States.

The power to vest assets of a foreign government with which the United States is engaged in armed hostilities is one that has been recognized for many decades. This power is being used here because it is clearly in the interests of the United States to have these funds available for use in rebuilding Iraq and launching that country on the path to speedy economic recovery. In addition, this authority is being invoked in a limited way, designed to minimize harm to third parties and to respect existing court orders as much as possible.

GEROGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 20, 2003.

RECONSTRUCTION

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as the Bush-Cheney-Rumsfeld war has begun, we must now turn our attention to the reconstruction. As we discuss the budget today, we must keep some facts in mind.

In a country where 60 percent of the people are entirely dependent on the Oil-for-Food Program run by the United Nations, which was ended 2 days ago, we are preparing to spend \$12 billion a month bombing and \$65 million for food, water, sanitation, shelter and health.

We have accepted full responsibility for the people of Iraq as of this day. We did the same for Afghanistan. We promised back in October of 2001, Bush and Blair said the conflict will not end, we will not walk away as the outside world has done before. The fact is we spent \$6.5 billion bombing Afghanistan,

and \$300 million was all we would commit for the first year. Mr. Karzai was in this country the other day begging for aid. He got \$50 million, and we told him \$35 million has to go to build a hospital.

I will include in the RECORD an article by George Monbiot.

A SCAR ON THE CONSCIENCE OF THE WORLD
LEFT BEHIND TO STARVE—A HUMANITARIAN DISASTER IS ENGULFING AFRICA AS CASH IS POURED INTO THE WAR WITH IRAQ AND ITS AFTERMATH

(By George Monbiot)

There is surely no more obvious symptom of the corruption of western politics than the disproportion between the money available for sustaining life and the money available for terminating it. We could, I think, expect that, if they were asked to vote on the matter, most of the citizens of the rich world would demand that their governments spend as much on humanitarian aid as they spend on developing new means of killing people. But the military-industrial complex is a beast which becomes both fiercer and greedier the more it is fed.

As the United States prepares to spend some \$12 billion a month on bombing the Iraqis, it has so far offered only \$65 million to provide them with food, water, sanitation, shelter and treatment for the injuries they are likely to receive. A confidential U.N. contingency plan for Iraq, which was leaked in January, suggests that the war could expose around one million children to "risk of death from malnutrition." It warns that "the collapse of essential services in Iraq could lead to a humanitarian emergency of proportions well beyond the capacity of U.N. agencies and other aid organizations." Around 60 percent of the population is entirely dependent on the oil for food programme, administered by the Iraqi government. This scheme was suspended by the U.N. yesterday, leaving the Iraqis reliant on foreign aid. The money pledged so far is enough to sustain the Iraqis for less than a fortnight.

It is hard to believe, however, that the U.S. Government will leave them to starve once it has captured their country. For the weeks or months during which Iraq dominates the news, the U.S. will be obliged to defend them from the most immediate impacts of the institutional collapse its war will cause. Afterwards, like the people of Afghanistan, the Iraqis will be first forgotten by the media and then deserted by those who promised to support them.

But even before the first troops cross the border, the impending war has caused a global humanitarian crisis. As donor countries set aside their aid budgets to save both themselves and the United States from embarrassment under the camera lights in Baghdad, they have all but ceased to provide money to other nations. The world, as a result, could soon be confronted by a humanitarian funding crisis graver than any since the end of the Second World War.

Every year, in November, the U.N. agencies which deal with disasters launch what they call a "consolidated appeal" for each of the countries suffering a "complex emergency". They expect to receive the money they request by May of the following year. The payments and promises they have extracted so far chart the collapse of international concern for the people of almost every nation except Iraq.

In Eritrea, for example, the drought is so severe that the water table has fallen by ten metres. Most of the nation's crops have failed and grain prices have doubled. Seventy percent of its 3.3 million people are now classified as vulnerable to famine. The United

Nations has asked the rich countries for \$163 million to help them. It has received \$4 million, or 2.5 percent of the money it requested.

Burundi, where almost one-sixth of the inhabitants have been forced out of their homes by conflict and natural disasters, and which is now officially listed as the third poorest nation on earth, has received 3 percent of its U.N. request. Liberia, where rebels have rendered much of the western part of the country uninhabitable, forcing some 500,000 people out of their homes, has been given 1.2 percent; Sierra Leone, where lassa fever is now rampaging through the refugee camps, has received 1 percent; and Guinea, which has recently taken 82,000 refugees from Cote d'Ivoire, 0.4 percent. Somalia, Sudan and the Democratic Republic of Congo have all received less than 6 percent.

Much of the money for these invisible countries has come from donor nations with relatively small economies, such as Sweden, Norway, Canada and Ireland. "The state of Africa", Tony Blair told his party conference in October 2001, "is a scar on the conscience of the world, but if the world focused on it, we could heal it". Well, let it now be a scar on the conscience of Tony Blair.

As a result of this unprecedented failure by the rich nations to cough up, the people of the forgotten countries will, very soon, begin to starve to death. The U.N. has warned that "a break in supplies" to Eritrea "is now inevitable". The World Food Programs has started feeding fewer people there, but will run out of food within two months. In Burundi it can, it says, continue feeding people "for another four weeks". Beans will run out in Liberia this month; cereals in May. One hundred thousand refugees in Guinea could find themselves without food by August. Yet neither of the two governments which are about to launch a "humanitarian war" appear to be concerned by the impending humanitarian catastrophes in the world's poorest nations.

The aid crisis is now so serious that it is restricting disaster relief even in nations which are considered by the major powers to be geopolitically important. The U.N. agencies have so far received just 2.9 percent of their request for Palestine, and 8.4 percent of the money they need in Afghanistan.

The latter figure is, in light of the repeated promises made by the nations prosecuting the war there, extraordinary. "To the Afghan people we make this commitment," Blair pledged during the same speech in October 2001. "The conflict will not be the end. We will not walk away, as the outside world has done so many times before." Three months later, the U.N. estimated that Afghanistan would need at least \$10 billion for reconstruction over the following five years. The U.S., which had just spent \$4.5 billion on bombing the country, offered \$300 million for the first year and refused to make any commitment for subsequent years. This year, George Bush "forgot" to produce an aid budget for Afghanistan, until he was forced to provide another \$300 million by Congress.

The government, which has an annual budget of just \$460 million—or around half of what the U.S., still spends every month on chasing remnants of Al Qaeda through the mountains—is effectively bankrupt. At the beginning of this month the Afghan president, Hamid Karzai, flew to Washington to beg George Bush for more money. He was given \$50 million, \$35 million of which the U.S., insists is spent on the construction of a five-star hotel in Kabul. Karzai, in other words, has discovered what the people of Iraq will soon find out: generosity dries up when you are yesterday's news.

If, somehow, you are still suffering from the delusion that this war is to be fought for

the sake of the Iraqi people, I would invite you to consider the record of the prosecuting nations. We may believe that George Bush and Tony Blair have the interests of foreigners at heart only when they spend more on feeding them than they spend on killing them.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HYDE (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today until 11 p.m. on account of medical reasons.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 153. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish penalties for aggravated identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

□ 0311

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 24, 2003, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1220. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mexican Fruit Fly; Treatments [Docket No. 02-129-2] received March 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1221. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mexican Fruit Fly; Addition of Regulated Area [Docket No. 02-129-3] received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1222. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Licensing and Inspection Requirements for Dealers of Dogs Intended for Hunting, Breeding, or Security Purposes [Docket No. 99-087-3] received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1223. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Experimental and Innovative Training — received February 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1224. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administra-

tion, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Penalties Under ERISA Section 502(c)(7) and Confirming Technical Changes on Civil Penalties Under ERISA Sections 502(c)(2), 502(c)(5) and 502(c)(6) (RIN: 1210-AA91, RIN: 1210-AA93) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1225. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Rule Relating to Notice of Blackout Periods to Participants and Beneficiaries (RIN: 1210-AA90) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1226. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Dept., Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received March 4, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1227. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Energy Information Administration's Annual Energy Review 2001, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 790f(a)(2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1228. A letter from the Director, National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities, NIH, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2001 Annual Report on Health Disparities Research of the National Institutes of Health, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 299a—1 Public Law 106—525, section 903 (a)(6); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1229. A letter from the Director, National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities, NIH, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a Strategic Research Plan and Budget to Reduce and Ultimately Eliminate Health Disparities for FY 2002-2006, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 287c—31 Public Law 106—525, section 105; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1230. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Animal Drugs; Phenylbutazone; Extralabel Animal Drug Use; Order of Prohibition [Docket No. 03N-0024] received March 11, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1231. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Permits for Construction, Modification, Relocation and Operation of Stationary Sources of Air Pollutants, Notification Requirements, Administrative Updates, Temporary Permits [WV055-6025a; FRL-7449-4] received February 25, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1232. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Blanket, TX) [MB Docket No. 02-351; RM-10601] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1233. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations

(Little Rock, AR) [MM Docket No. 00-139; RM-9915] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1234. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Ridgway and Rangely, CO) [MB Docket No. 02-118; RM-10394] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1235. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations, (Rose Hill and La Grange, NC) [MB Docket No. 02-110; RM-10406] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1236. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Greenwood, MS) [MB Docket No. 02-209; RM10512]; Hyannis, NE [MB Docket No. 02-210; RM-10510]; Wall, SD [MB Docket No. 02-211; RM-10511] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1237. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Murrieta, Arcadia, Fallbrook, Yucca Valley, and Desert Hot Springs, CA) [MM Docket No. 01-11; RM-10027, RM-10322] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1238. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Monroe and Luna Pier, MI) [MB Docket No. 02-115; RM-10427] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1239. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Crawfordville, GA) [MB Docket No. 02-225; RM-10517] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1240. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Dickens, TX) [MB Docket No. 02-258; RM-10500]; (Floydada, Texas) [MB Docket No. 02-259; RM-10501]; (Rankin, Texas) [MB Docket No. 02-262; RM-10504]; (San Diego, Texas) [MB Docket No. 02-264; RM-10505]; (Westbrook, Texas) [MB Docket No. 02-265; RM-10556] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1241. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Jasper, FL) [MB Docket No. 02-274; RM-10560]; Tigerton, WI [MB Docket No. 02-275; RM-10561] received

March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1242. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations, (Madisonville and College Station, Giddings, and Bay City, Columbus, Edna, Garwood, Palacios and Sheridan, TX) [MM Docket No. 99-331; RM-9728, RM-9847, RM-9848] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1243. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Source Material Reporting Under International Agreements (RIN: 3150-AH10) received March 10, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1244. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification pursuant to Section 1203 (d) of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 and the the FREEDOM Support Act (Public Law 102-511); to the Committee on International Relations.

1245. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's inventory of activities that are not inherently governmental functions as required by Section 2 of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998, Public Law 105-270; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1246. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Semiannual Management Report to Congress for April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002, and the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1247. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting a copy of the Department's Commercial Activities Inventory for Fiscal Year 2002; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1248. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting notification that effective March 1, 2003, the Director resigned; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1249. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Notices (RIN: 1029-AB99) received February 24, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1250. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Global Ocean Data Assimilation Experiment (GODAE) [Docket No. 021202295-2295-01] received February 24, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1251. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 021212306-2306-01; I.D. 021403] received March 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1252. A letter from the Chief Scout Executive and President, Boy Scouts of America,

transmitting the Boy Scouts of America 2002 report to the Nation, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 28; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1253. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's legislative proposal to restructure the patent fees and adjust trademark fees for the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1254. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Forms Services Division, INS, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Abbreviation or Waiver of Training for State or Local Law Enforcement Officers Authorized to Enforce Immigration Law During a Mass Influx of Aliens [INS No. 2241-02] (RIN: 1115-AG84) received February 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1255. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Forms Services, INS, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Visa and Passport Waiver for Certain Permanent Residents of Canada and Bermuda [INS No. 2202-02] (RIN: 1115-AG68) received February 4, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1256. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Admission and Orientation Program: Removal From Rules [BOP-1110-1] (RIN: 1120-AB08) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1257. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Forms Services Division, INS, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Automated Inspection Services—Extension of Enrollment Period [INS No. 2256-03] (RIN: 1115-AG94) received March 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1258. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Forms Services, INS, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Release of Information Regarding Immigration and Naturalization Service Detainees in Non-Federal Facilities [INS No. 2203-02] (RIN: 1115-AG67) received January 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1259. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Forms Services, INS, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of a \$3 Immigration User Fee for Certain Commercial Vessel Passengers Previously Exempt [INS No. 2180-01] (RIN: 1115-AG47) received January 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1260. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Aliens and Nationality; Homeland Security; Reorganization of Regulations [EOIR No. 137F; AG Order No. 2662-2003] (RIN:1125-AA42) received March 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1261. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Documentation of Immigrants — Elimination of Extended Visa Validity Benefits under Section 154 Pub. L. 101-649 — received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1262. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Documentation of Immigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended — Issuance of New or Replacement Visas

(RIN: 1400-AB39) received March 11, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1263. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Miss America Pageant, Atlantic City, New Jersey [COTP Philadelphia-02-005] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1264. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Industrial Canal, one-quarter mile north and south of the Almonaster Bridge, New Orleans, Louisiana [COTP New Orleans-02-018] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1265. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile Marker 52.0 to 53.0, Cape Girardeau, MO [COTP Paducah, KY 02-006] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1266. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Atchafalaya River, Port of Morgan City, Morgan City, LA [COTP Morgan City-02-005] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1267. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mississippi Sound, Pascagoula, Mississippi [COTP Mobile-02-017] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1268. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile 90.0 to 91.0, Wheeling, West Virginia [COTP Pittsburgh-02-014] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1269. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Coast Guard Activities New York [CGD01-02-103] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1270. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; All water within 100 ft of the M/F FUJI MARU while transiting Apra Harbor and while moored at Hotel Wharf, Port Authority of Guam, Territory of Guam [COTP GUAM-02-016] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1271. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Port of New York/New Jersey [CGD01-02-120] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1272. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department

of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Ashley River, Charleston, SC [CGD07-03-018] received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1273. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Monongahela River, Mile Marker 0.0 to Mile 1.3 and Allegheny River Mile Marker 0.0 to Mile Marker 0.5, Pittsburgh, PA [COTP Pittsburgh-02-020] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1274. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Allegheny River Mile Marker 0.0 to Mile Marker 0.3, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania [COTP Pittsburgh-02-021] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1275. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Monongahela River Mile: 22.5 to 23.5 [COTP Pittsburgh-02-015] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1276. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Chickahominy River, Williamsburg, Virginia [CGD05-02-045] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1277. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; 4th of July Celebration, Marblehead, Massachusetts [CGD1-02-080] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1278. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Triathlon Swim, Hudson River, Ulster Landing, NY [CGD01-02-081] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1279. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Strategic Booming Exercise in Absecon Inlet, New Jersey [COTP Philadelphia-02-002] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1280. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administration Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulation; Horn Island Sea Buoy (HI) at the entrance to Horn Island Pass in the Gulf of Mexico to Bayou Casotte, Mississippi [COTP Mobile, AL 02-009] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1281. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fourth of

July Fireworks, Lake City, MN [COTP St. Louis, MO-02-011] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1282. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GICW), Mile Marker 210 to 225 (EHL), Fort Walton Beach, Florida [COTP Mobile-02-013] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1283. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; First Night Summer Best Fireworks, Dorchester Bay, Dorchester, MA [CGD01-02-097] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1284. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Yankee Homecoming Fireworks, Cashman Park, Newburyport, MA [CGD01-02-095] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1285. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety and Security Zone; Boston's Fourth of July Esplanade Events, Charles River Esplanade, Boston, Massachusetts [CDG01-02-088] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1286. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of the Dimensions of the Grand Canyon National Park Special Flight Rules [Docket No. FAA-2001-8690] (RIN: 2120-AG74) received March 7, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1287. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Pioneer Dock, Kachemak Bay, Homer, Alaska [COTP Western Alaska 02-008] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1288. A letter from the Trial Attorney, FRA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conforming the Federal Railroad Administration's Accident/Incident Reporting Requirements to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's Revised Reporting Requirements; Other Amendments [Docket No. FRA-2002-13221, Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AB51) received February 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1289. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Coast Guard Board for Correction of Military Records; Procedural Regulation [OST Docket No. 2002-13439; Notice 2002-1] (RIN: 2105-AD19) received February 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1290. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Scientific and Technical Reports (RIN: 2700-AC33) received February 10, 2003, pursuant to

5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

1291. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Board of Veterans' Appeals, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Appeals Regulations: Title for Members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals (RIN: 2900-AK62) received February 10, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1292. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Provision of Drugs and Medicines to Certain Veterans in State Homes (RIN: 2900-AJ34) received March 12, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1293. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Deferral of Duty on Large Yachts Imported for Sale [T.D. 03-14] (RIN: 1515-AC58) received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1294. A letter from the Acting Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in the Insular Possessions Watch, Watch Movement and Jewelry Program [Docket No. 991228350-2301-04] (RIN: 0625-AA57) received February 11, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1295. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability [Rev. Proc. 2003-24] received March 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1296. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability [Rev. Proc. 2003-25] received March 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1297. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Areas in which rulings will not be issued (domestic areas) [Rev. Proc. 2003-3, 2003-1] received February 10, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1298. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Amendment of 26 CFR Section 301.6103(n)-1 to Incorporate Taxpayer Browsing Protection Act [TD 9044] (RIN: 1545-BB13) received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1299. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Earned income credit for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1978 [TD 9045] (RIN: 1545-BA34) received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1300. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Interest rates; underpayments and overpayments (Rev. Rul. 2003-30) received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1301. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Disallowance of Deductions and Credits for Failure to File Timely Return [TD 9043] (RIN: 1545-AY26) received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1302. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's legislative proposal entitled, "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes"; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Resources, Ways and Means, Government Reform, the Judiciary, Veterans' Affairs, Financial Services, Science, Education and the Workforce, International Relations, the Budget, and * * *

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. OSE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COX, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. OTTER, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 1372. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to require enhanced disclosures of employee stock options, and to require a study on the economic impact of broad-based employee stock option plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. FEENEY):

H.R. 1373. A bill to provide options to States to innovate and improve the education of children with disabilities by expanding the choices for students and parents under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. REYES, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FROST, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1374. A bill to amend chapter 1606 of title 10, United States Code, to increase the amount of basic educational assistance for members of the Selected Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 1375. A bill to provide regulatory relief and improve productivity for insured depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BACHUS, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 1376. A bill to improve the Enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 1377. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to enhance the access of Medicare beneficiaries who live in medically underserved areas to critical primary and preventive health care benefits, to improve the MedicareChoice program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 1378. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to increase payments to States for expenditures for short term training of staff of certain child welfare agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 1379. A bill to freeze the price of gasoline pending analysis by the Secretary of Energy of fluctuations in such price; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HALL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. CANNON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. DUNN, Mr. RENZI, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DREIER, and Mr. FLETCHER):

H.R. 1380. A bill to suspend the excise tax on aviation fuel used in commercial aviation during the period of hostilities with Iraq; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. REYES, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BACA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. STARK, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 1381. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 and title 5, United States Code, to allow leave for individuals who provide living organ donations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHADEGG:

H.R. 1382. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the regulatory operation of the Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act (EMTALA); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 1383. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for the

conversion of cooperative housing corporations into condominiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1384. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to eliminate a limitation on benefits; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 1385. A bill to extend the provision of title 39, United States Code, under which the United States Postal Service is authorized to issue a special postage stamp to benefit breast cancer research; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BONILLA:

H.R. 1386. A bill to amend part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants and loan guarantees for health centers to enable the centers to fund capital needs projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1387. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a vocational and technical entrepreneurship development program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 1388. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare Program for surgical first assisting services of certified registered nurse first assistants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BELL, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 1389. A bill to enhance the ability of first responders to respond to incidents of terrorism and for certain other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Science, the Judiciary, and Homeland Security (Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1390. A bill to establish a pilot program to encourage certification of teachers in low-income, low-performing public elementary and secondary schools by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 1391. A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for commencement of construction of the Mt. Hope Waterpower project (FERC Project No. 9401), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. OTTER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 1392. A bill to require inspection of all cargo on commercial trucks and vessels entering the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JANKLOW (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1393. A bill to ensure that tax-exempt status and other benefits afforded under Operation Enduring Freedom are also provided to United States Armed Forces personnel in Israel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FROST, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CASE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BAKER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H.R. 1394. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize programs and activities to promote intermodal transportation of passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1395. A bill to provide for the establishment of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application programs for fuel cell and hydrogen production, delivery, and storage technologies for transportation and stationary applications; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1396. A bill to allocate spectrum for the enhancement of wireless telecommunications, and to invest wireless spectrum auction proceeds for the military preparedness and educational preparedness of the United States for the digital era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1397. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to ensure that employees are not improperly disqualified from benefits under pension plans and welfare plans based on the misclassification or reclassification of their status; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 1398. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to fully fund 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for programs under part B of that Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 1399. A bill to revise the boundary of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BERRY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. STARK, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CASE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FROST, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SABO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 1400. A bill to provide for substantial reductions in the price of prescription drugs for Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 1401. A bill to support the establishment or expansion and operation of programs using a network of public and private community entities to provide mentoring for children in foster care; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ORTIZ (for himself, Mr. REYES, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 1402. A bill to designate a United States courthouse in Brownsville, Texas, as the "Garza-Vela United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1403. A bill to remove the exemption with respect to Pakistan from the prohibition on assistance to a country whose elected head of government was deposed by decree or military coup; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1404. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to present a ribbon of appropriate design to all persons who, while a member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty, were exposed to ionizing radiation as a result of participation in a test of atomic weapons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1405. A bill to disqualify certain persons from receiving Federal funds; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. HART, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TOOMEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MURTHA):

H.R. 1406. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit additional States to enter into long-term care partnerships under the Medicaid Program in order to promote the use of long-term care insurance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 1407. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to enhance security at executive and judicial branch facilities by requiring locksmiths who provide locksmith services at such a facility to be credentialed, which includes undergoing a criminal history background check; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 1408. A bill to provide for the consideration of a petition for Federal Recognition of the Lumbee Indians of Robeson and adjoining counties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma):

H.R. 1409. A bill to provide for a Federal land exchange for the environmental, educational, and cultural benefit of the American public and the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 1410. A bill to amend chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to authorize the use of clinical social workers to conduct evaluations to determine work-related emotional and mental illnesses; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 1411. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to extend from three months to twelve months the period after release of a member of the Armed Forces from active duty during which the member is protected from mortgage foreclosure under that Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.J. Res. 41. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted to Congress by the Department of Veterans Affairs on January 22, 2003, with the title "VA Acquisition Regulation: Simplified Acquisition Procedures for Health-Care Resources"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. GOODE):

H.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to deny United States citizenship to individuals born in the United States to parents who are neither United States citizens nor persons who owe permanent allegiance to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. NEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FROST, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATSON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. STARK, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. KILDEE):

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning support to members of the United States Armed Forces and allied military forces engaged in the war on terrorism and the war with Iraq; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be

subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution expressing the support and appreciation of the Nation for the President and the members of the Armed forces who are participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning support to members of the United States Armed Forces and allied military forces engaged in the war on terrorism and the war with Iraq; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring America's Jewish community on the occasion of its 350th anniversary, supporting the designation of an "American Jewish History Month", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FROST, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BACA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution urging increased Federal funding for juvenile (Type 1) diabetes research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution encouraging corporations to contribute to faith-based organizations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. OTTER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Ms. HART, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. DUNN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. RENZI):

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the Blue Star Banner and the Gold Star; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AKIN (for himself, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mrs.

MYRICK, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SOUDER):

H. Res. 153. A resolution recognizing the public need for fasting and prayer in order to secure the blessings and protection of Providence for the people of the United States and our Armed Forces during the conflict in Iraq and under the threat of terrorism at home; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H. Res. 154. A resolution commending the Prime Minister of Great Britain for his stalwart leadership and unwavering support of the United States in the effort to disarm Saddam Hussein of weapons of mass destruction and free the Iraqi people of the scourge of brutal dictatorship; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York (for himself, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Res. 155. A resolution concerning the formation of the African Union; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H. Res. 156. A resolution recognizing the goals and objectives of the Intelligent Transportation Systems Caucus; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 157. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding several individuals who are being held as prisoners of conscience by the Chinese Government for their involvement in efforts to end the Chinese occupation of Tibet; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 20: Mr. STARK, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 21: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 22: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 33: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. OXLEY.

H. R. 44: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 73: Ms. HART, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 74: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 126: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 135: Mr. ISAKSON and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 141: Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 173: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 217: Mrs. KELLY, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 218: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SHAW, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. FEENEY.

H.R. 221: Mr. FILNER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 235: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 253: Mr. PETRI and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 284: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFLEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 286: Mr. KOLBE and Mr. ISAKSON.
 H.R. 303: Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 313: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 328: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 348: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. JENKINS.
 H.R. 387: Mr. FLAKE.
 H.R. 401: Mr. CANTOR and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 412: Mr. CASE, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 423: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
 H.R. 424: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
 H.R. 432: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 434: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 450: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. TIAHRT.
 H.R. 466: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 489: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
 H.R. 495: Mr. FLAKE.
 H.R. 501: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 515: Mr. BELL.
 H.R. 522: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. TAUZIN.
 H.R. 527: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. ISAKSON.
 H.R. 528: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 548: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 568: Mr. BOEHLERT.
 H.R. 569: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 583: Mr. FORBES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NEY, Mr. RENZI, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mrs. BONO.
 H.R. 584: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. AKIN.
 H.R. 586: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 612: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
 H.R. 613: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 614: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 623: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. BOYD.
 H.R. 648: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 660: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
 H.R. 664: Mr. WU., Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. MENENDEZ.
 H.R. 668: Mr. HOFFFEL.
 H.R. 673: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 678: Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 683: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 684: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. TIAHRT.
 H.R. 706: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 709: Mr. GOODE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. GILLMOR.
 H.R. 715: Mr. GORDON and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 721: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 735: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. BAKER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 759: Mr. OTTER, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 765: Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 767: Mr. HOUGHTON and Mr. WELLER.
 H.R. 768: Mr. TIAHRT.
 H.R. 770: Mr. RUSH and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 771: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
 H.R. 775: Mr. BAKER, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
 H.R. 776: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 780: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 785: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 786: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 792: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
 H.R. 808: Mr. TERRY, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. WELLER.
 H.R. 814: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. SABO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
 H.R. 815: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 823: Mr. WALSH, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 839: Mr. FOLEY.
 H.R. 871: Mr. OXLEY.
 H.R. 872: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. FEENEY.
 H.R. 876: Mr. DEMINT, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. SHUSTER.
 H.R. 879: Mr. SCHROCK and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 882: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 883: Mr. BOYD.
 H.R. 898: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 919: Mr. HAYES, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. BEAUPREZ.
 H.R. 920: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 931: Mr. BONNER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 932: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SAXTON, and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 933: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 935: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 936: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 953: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 961: Mr. NUSSLE.
 H.R. 967: Mr. CASE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 970: Mr. WICKER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FROST, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 976: Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 977: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 1007: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 1032: Mr. CAMP.
 H.R. 1036: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. GILCHREST.
 H.R. 1046: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HILL, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 1054: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 1057: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 1063: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 1066: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1068: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BELL, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 1070: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BEAUPREZ, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 1072: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 1077: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1085: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 1098: Mr. GIBBONS.
 H.R. 1105: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1110: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 1115: Mr. FLAKE.
 H.R. 1118: Mr. ROSS, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
 H.R. 1136: Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 1157: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1170: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 1177: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. REYNOLDS.
 H.R. 1185: Ms. NORTON and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 1213: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 1225: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. BALLENGER.
 H.R. 1227: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
 H.R. 1234: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 1236: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 1240: Mr. NADLER and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1241: Mr. BERMAN.
 H.R. 1242: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 1246: Ms. LEE, AND MS. NORTON.
 H.R. 1252: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1260: Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 1264: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. REYES, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. COSTELLO.
 H.R. 1266: Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 1267: Mr. NADLER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA.
 H.R. 1270: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
 H.R. 1282: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 1288: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MICA, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 1294: Mr. KILDEE AND Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1313: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 1337: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 1343: Mr. BAIRD and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1357: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.J. Res. 4: Mr. MURPHY.
 H.J. Res. 28: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.J. Res. 29: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. WATT.
 H.J. Res. 30: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WATT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. LEE.
 H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
 H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. AKIN and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
 H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
 H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. McNULTY.
 H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. HONDA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SABO, and Mr. McNULTY.
 H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. SOUDER.
 H. Res. 21: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of

California, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CASE, Mr. REYES, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 49: Mr. KIRK, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. CARTER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 59: Mr. BLUNT.

H. Res. 108: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. BAIRD.

H. Res. 113: Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 118: Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Ms. DELAURO.

H. Res. 121: Mr. DINGELL.

H. Res. 133: Mr. MILLER of Florida.